



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 111th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 156

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, JANUARY 26, 2010

No. 10

House of Representatives

The House met at 12:30 p.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. LARSEN of Washington).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
January 26, 2010.

I hereby appoint the Honorable RICK LARSEN to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 6, 2009, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 30 minutes and each Member, other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip, limited to 5 minutes.

U.S. AND WORLD RESPONDS TO HAITI'S EARTHQUAKE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, it has now been 2 weeks since a 7.0 earthquake struck Haiti on the afternoon of January 12. Over these past 14 days, we have seen pictures of the devastation of Port-au-Prince and the surrounding communities. Estimates of the number of dead continue to rise. And the injured in the capital alone is already in the tens of thousands, many needing sophisticated medical care. People live

in the streets and open spaces, fearful of the daily aftershocks. The very basics of life, water, food, and shelter are absent or in short supply.

We watch in anguish as we learn about the potential number of newly orphaned children in a country that already had around 400,000 orphans. The Washington Post ran a story on Saturday about how 75 percent of the schools have been destroyed and the deaths of so many teachers and students. Nearly every Haitian family in the affected areas suffered the loss of at least one loved one, and nearly every UN, international agency, and NGO operating in the area suffered devastating losses among their Haitian and international staff.

And while our own U.S. Embassy staff and aid agencies worked around the clock to respond to the crisis, each and every one of them are also dealing with their own shock and grief over lost family members and Haitian and U.S. colleagues.

In my congressional district, Mr. Speaker, Britney Gengel, the daughter of Len and Cherylann Gengel from Rutland, Massachusetts, remains missing. She is among the approximately 200 Haitian and foreign nationals who were in the Hotel Montana when the earthquake struck. She was part of a student team from Florida's Lynn University in Haiti working with Food for the Poor. In the few days that she was in Haiti, she had already emailed her parents to tell them that she felt that she had found her life's calling.

Hundreds of search and rescue workers have been active day and night at the Hotel Montana, including U.S. teams from Fairfax, Virginia; Miami-Dade; and Los Angeles counties. One rescue worker, talking with Britney's father, spoke movingly about how this was one of the worst sites he had ever worked on, and if his daughter were trapped here, he wouldn't give up on finding her either. The compassion and

empathy of the rescue workers and every member of our U.S. Embassy team are palpable, and their commitment to all victims' families is total.

We see on our television and read in the papers and online of the generosity and resilience of the human spirit: people helping people, comforting one another, sacrificing for the well-being of one another. We often forget how much the Haitian people are helping one another as we struggle to provide and get aid to them.

Governments, international agencies, NGOs, corporations, and individuals have responded and mobilized as never before. On Friday evening, I was in my hometown of Worcester, Massachusetts, at an event entitled Worcester Cares for Haiti, to mobilize donations from our local community. And I am sure that many Members of this House have been at similar events in their own districts.

Aid is pouring into Haiti to reach the more than 3 million people directly affected by the earthquake. It is flying in to Santo Domingo and Barahona airports in the Dominican Republic and being trucked overland in vast convoys. It is landing at the Port-au-Prince airport, which now receives over 100 flights day and night. And thanks to our Navy and Coast Guard, the destroyed Port-au-Prince docks are now 30 percent operational.

I want to thank all the nations of the world that have responded so generously. I especially want to thank our hemispheric neighbors, many of whom annually suffer from natural disasters and still struggle to overcome centuries of poverty. They have been particularly generous, from Argentina, Brazil, and Chile to Colombia, Cuba, Mexico, and so many others. And a very special thank you to the Government and people of the Dominican Republic.

To my own government, Secretary Clinton, Secretary Gates, Administrator Raj Shah, Secretary Napolitano,

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H333

and all of the agencies, officers, and staff here in Washington and on the ground in Haiti, who, when faced with a Herculean task, have more than risen to the occasion. And I want to say how grateful I am for all that you have done, are doing, and will be doing in the days, weeks, and months to come. I have seen firsthand your commitment, compassion, expertise, and professionalism. I am sure that mistakes have been made, but no one wants the aid to arrive more quickly and get to those who need it more than the U.S. personnel on the ground in Haiti.

For myself, I have never been more proud of my government or more grateful for the people who serve in it.

Mr. Speaker, I will insert into the RECORD a story that appeared in *The Washington Post* entitled, "Death toll growing at Port-au-Prince's Hotel Montana, once a symbol of stability."

[From the *Washington Post*, Jan. 24, 2010]

DEATH TOLL GROWING AT PORT-AU-PRINCE'S HOTEL MONTANA, ONCE A SYMBOL OF STABILITY

(By William Booth)

Before the earthquake, the Hotel Montana was the place to be in Haiti. During coups and crises, it provided air-conditioned shelter from the political storms for the diplomats, spies and aid workers—and a few heavy-duty criminals—who gathered nightly at the News Bar under a towering mahogany tree to sip rum sours concocted by Monsieur Lauren, known as the best barman in the country.

To many foreigners, as well as the Haitian elite, the Montana stood for security and stability in a country that often lacked both. Now the Port-au-Prince landmark lies in ruins, as families of missing American, Canadian and French citizens press their embassies for any news of life at the scene of the most concentrated international search-and-rescue effort mounted since the Jan. 12 quake.

It does not look good. As body identification teams proceed with their grim assignment, the list of the dead is growing—posted on a tree in the hotel's circular drive because the reception desk is buried under rubble. Most reporters are being kept away as workers in white biohazard suits pull bodies out and then stumble off to vomit in the bushes.

"Except for miracles, hope is unfortunately fading," Elisabeth Byrs, a spokeswoman for the United Nations' Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs, said Saturday.

Some rescue workers have said privately that too many resources have been deployed at the Montana, at the expense of searches elsewhere, and that the U.S. and other governments have focused more attention on those missing at the hotel than on Haitian survivors.

A Facebook page, Haiti Earthquake Hotel Montana, had more than 13,000 members as of Saturday evening and is filled with news, prayers, frustration—and photos of those probably lost in the quake. The posts are poignant: "Diane Cave, Room 220, may have been on way to gym" or "David Apperson last seen in lobby."

Some people post messages of support not only for the families but also for the missing. It is not as strange as it might seem. Cellphone service, disrupted at first, has improved. Someone in the rubble could have received e-mail.

The affiliations of the missing tell part of the story. Many guests at the Montana were

working for organizations such as Food for the Poor, Compassion International and the United Methodist Committee on Relief.

A dozen students from Lynn University in Boca Raton, Fla., were here volunteering with Food for the Poor. Four of them, all women, are missing, along with two faculty members who accompanied them.

Angel Aloma, executive director of Food for the Poor, stood in the driveway in the gathering darkness, hugging Gerthe Cardoso, one of the hotel's owners. The two were going through names of staff members, with Aloma asking whether they were alive and Cardoso answering—yes, no, yes.

"These were not employees, they were family," Cardoso said. "Our accountant, our waiters. Some had been with us for 15 or 20 years. They came to weddings, birthdays, funerals."

Aloma asked after the famous bartender. "He is gone," Cardoso said, her eyes filling with tears. "Oh, Lauren!"

"Our staff member LeAnn Chong, they saved her after 17 hours of digging," Aloma said. "They had to cut off her hair to get her out."

Many survivors lost far more. Rescue teams describe the work at the Montana as "highly technical" and "medically extreme." Some rescues took 24 hours. Buried survivors subsisted on a trickle of their own urine until rescuers could get an intravenous needle into dehydrated veins. One survivor spent four days in a painful crouch. Some heard other people's last words, their last breaths.

The Rev. Clinton Rabb, in Haiti for a meeting with Methodist aid workers, was freed Jan. 15 after a French surgeon sawed through one leg at the knee and the other at the ankle. Still conscious, Rabb emerged from a tunnel dug into the rubble, like a miner being pulled from a collapsed shaft, and was whisked away in a Navy helicopter. He died last Sunday in a Florida hospital.

HELP FROM AN IPHONE APP

For nine days, an intense rescue effort took place at the Montana, with teams from Fairfax County, France, Chile, Brazil, Colombia and elsewhere working sections. Throughout Haiti, more than 50 teams had rescued 132 people by Saturday. U.S. teams took part in 47 rescues. Some of the most dramatic were at the Montana.

Dan Woolley was in Haiti with Compassion International making a video about poor children. He had just returned to the hotel that Tuesday afternoon when the 7.0-magnitude quake brought the 145-room hotel crashing down. Woolley was trapped in a space by an elevator shaft. It was pitch black, but he used his iPhone first-aid app to treat his leg fracture. He lost his glasses but used his digital single-lens reflex camera to focus and both devices to create a weak glow.

"He used the little light he had to write letters to his wife and his kids," said Raul Perla of the Fairfax team that helped French rescuers pull him out 60 hours later. "Can you imagine?"

Other people, just a few feet away, have not been rescued. A colleague of Woolley's, David Hames, was last seen 20 feet from the elevator shaft where Woolley was found. "David is an amazing family man, the host and creator of the kids' show 'Cranium's Ark,' much loved by hundreds, maybe thousands," a friend, Melanie Dobson, said by e-mail.

The family-owned Montana, built in 1946 in the hills of Port-au-Prince with just 12 rooms, had grown into a sprawling compound with shops, a swimming pool and conference facilities.

Now rescue workers store oxygen tanks in the half-empty pool. On the lawn is a make-

shift shower. Piles of rotting meal rations sit by the fabled News Bar. Beside the conference room stairs, a man in a light-blue shirt, pressed flat by the roof, lies like a flower between the pages of a book.

The place reeks.

'IT'S A LITTLE MIRACLE'

The president of Lynn University, Kevin M. Ross, pressed this week for the return of remains, including those of the four Lynn students missing in the Montana. "This is needed for every grieving father, son, mother, daughter, friend and neighbor who is aching at this very moment for a phone call," Ross said. "A missing family member, whether alive or dead, must be returned to his or her loved ones."

Last week, rumors spread in Port-au-Prince that a popular Montana co-owner, Nadine Cardoso-Riedl, had been killed in her office. Then, just as suddenly, word spread that she was alive.

"We had a little dog, a beagle, that was up on the roof by the terrace, and he alerted, he picked up a scent, but when we brought other dogs to confirm, they couldn't smell her," said Camilo Monroy of the Colombian Civil Defense rescue squad. "We went back the next day, and the same beagle smelled her, and we called, and someone answered. We brought over her son, and he said, 'I think that is my mother down there.'"

The Colombians and other teams dug one tunnel, then a second. Cardoso-Riedl responded, saying two other people were near her. One was perhaps a boy. Sometimes she was lucid, sometimes she appeared to lose consciousness and could not assist the rescuers when they asked: "Are we close? Can you hear us?"

More than 100 hours after her hotel fell down on her, she was pulled out. "It's a little miracle," her husband, Reinhard Riedl, told reporters. "She's one tough cookie. She is indestructible."

Her sister, Gerthe, said Nadine had been kidnapped in Haiti a few years ago and held captive for 15 days. "You have no idea what it takes to survive here," she said.

AN APPEAL TO THE COMMON SENSE OF THE SENATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. STEARNS. I rise today in the hopes of appealing to the common sense of my colleagues in the United States Senate. In a few days, they will vote on whether or not Ben Bernanke will serve a second term as Federal Reserve Chairman. For the good of American taxpayers and the greater economy, his nomination should be rejected.

As Chairman of the Federal Reserve, Mr. Bernanke has intervened in the financial marketplace in an unprecedented way. He has instituted un-American policies that have distorted our free market economy, such as picking winners and losers, and the creation of "too big to fail." Both Republicans and Democrats alike have argued that the Fed itself was a significant factor in creating the worst economic and financial crisis our Nation has faced in a generation.

Where is the justification in reconfirming Ben Bernanke? Under him, interest rates were kept too low for too

long, as the Fed simultaneously increased the money supply and economic bubbles were created. In 2006, financial experts throughout the Nation pointed out that the housing bubble was collapsing, yet the Fed took no action until it was too late, and tens of thousands of families found themselves in foreclosure.

Another major factor in the economic meltdown was the questionable financial transactions by the holding companies of the largest banks and Wall Street firms, which are regulated by the Federal Reserve. It is clear now that the Fed abdicated its role as a regulator of these entities. Just last month, Mr. Bernanke admitted in front of the Senate Banking Committee that, "In the area where we had responsibility, the bank holding companies, we should have done more."

The irony of his comments are that the Fed has plenty of power and authority to deal with the kinds of abuses we have seen in the financial industry and within the housing market, but they refused to act. Under the leadership of Mr. Bernanke, the Fed chose to ignore the abuses going on in the mortgage industry, particularly with subprime loans.

The Fed also chose to ignore Wall Street's risky off-balance-sheet transactions that created a domino effect that rippled through our economy. Bloomberg reported that the Fed itself entered into trillions in off-balance-sheet transactions last year, but the Fed's own Inspector General has not even attempted to audit or to investigate these transactions. Astoundingly, Mr. Bernanke is now advocating that Congress grant the Fed even greater regulatory power. We need to audit the Federal Reserve now.

In discussing Mr. Bernanke's failings as Fed Chairman, it is important to point out that he served on the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve from 2002 to 2005 before becoming Chairman. He is no novice, yet he ignored distress calls about our imminent financial meltdown.

And Mr. Bernanke has not been forthcoming in explaining to Congress and the American people who in the private sector the Fed has chosen to subsidize with American taxpayers' dollars and for what reason and for what amounts. Mr. Bernanke has also been unable to fully explain and account for the \$500 billion the Fed has lent to central banks in Europe. Instead, he continues to hide behind the longstanding premise that monetary policy should be free from political pressure, coupled with the convenience of the Fed not being a public agency and, thus, not being obligated to publicly account for its actions.

Mr. Speaker, it is not his money. It belongs to the American taxpayers. Under Mr. Bernanke's leadership, the Fed even strove to keep the details of AIG's overpayments to its counterparties secret, as recently revealed by a newly disclosed e-mail from a New

York Fed official. The e-mail clearly demonstrates the kind of culture that Bernanke oversaw at the Fed, one of secrecy and willingness to stifle important public disclosure pertaining to the financial crisis. But again, it is not his money.

After the difficult financial year we have had, common sense dictates a change in leadership at the Federal Reserve. Reconfirming Mr. Bernanke to a second term is like putting a stamp of approval on the health of our unstable economy while guaranteeing more of the same failed policies. More of the same is not the solution to our economic downturn and crisis in the financial markets. We need a complete departure from the failed policies of the past.

Mr. Bernanke steered our financial system directly onto the rocks. Should we really put him at the helm again? No.

BANK BAILOUTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Arizona (Mrs. KIRKPATRICK) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express outrage, outrage at the information that has recently come to light about the AIG bailout. Though it may not be clear yet who should be held accountable, one thing is clear: The American people will not tolerate the use of taxpayer dollars for use in backdoor bailouts where the details are treated as classified, using methods typically reserved for matters of national security.

Though some financial matters may require protection as a matter of national security, it does not appear that the AIG bailout rises to that standard. At a time when our Nation is actively engaged in wars on two fronts, and terrorists and traffickers are always looking for means to breach our defenses, such treatment should be reserved for documents pertaining to actual security threats.

I opposed the Troubled Asset Relief Program from the very beginning because it focused too much on Wall Street and its executives and not enough on the problems that face working Arizona families. It does too little to hold accountable the banks and corporations that have benefited from billions in taxpayer dollars. The House Oversight Committee and the GAO are now investigating the entire AIG bailout. They should complete their work as quickly as possible so the results can be released to the American taxpayers.

□ 1245

BREAKING THE UNEMPLOYMENT BARRIER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) for 5 minutes.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask how we can break the national 10 percent unemployment barrier which has now hit my home State of Florida hard with a totally unacceptable 11.8 percent unemployment rate.

The congressional leadership has created a cloud of uncertainty over the economy, with support for more oppressive regulations, skyrocketing deficits, tax increases, and trade barriers. The administration's spending policies, including the nearly \$1 trillion stimulus bill, have drastically increased the national debt by 23 percent, while unemployment has increased by more than 3 million. And today the CBO announced that the U.S. deficit for the current fiscal year will come in at \$1.3 trillion, which means that in the 1 year in which the party controlling the White House and Congress has been entrenched, the annual deficit has increased by over 300 percent.

We need to do everything we can to encourage entrepreneurs and small businesses to once again create jobs through sensible regulation, through reduced government spending, lower taxes and greater investment in education.

I am looking forward to the President's State of the Union message to see what course he has set for this year and will look forward to working with Members in a bipartisan manner to help bring our economy to full employment as soon as possible.

NATIONAL SCHOOL COUNSELING WEEK

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Later on, Mr. Speaker, we will be discussing an important resolution which designates the week of February 1 as National School Counseling Week on behalf of each and every child that these counselors have helped. As a mother, as a grandmother, and as a former Florida certified teacher, I recognize just how important it is to fully support our children at every turn. School counselors across the Nation share the same commendable goal to meet the needs of every child. They work each and every day to offer our children their expert guidance and compassionate care. Whether at home or in school, every child will face new and sometimes difficult situations as they develop into young adults. Through a strong family, many children are able to navigate potentially difficult situations, emotions and decisions from a positive base. But even with the most cohesive and supportive of families, there are times when a growing child needs outside counsel.

Our school counselors can offer children this vital resource: trusted and impartial guides in times of uncertainty as well as thoughtful friends for uncomfortable questions. And they willingly work with all children, regardless of their background or history, and are often the last lifeline for our troubled children.

We all recognize that children go through tremendous social, personal

and emotional development, all while being tasked with achieving academic success. Ensuring that our children are prepared to be tomorrow's adults requires that each of these components come together seamlessly. Our children are being forced to grow up faster than any generation before them. Today's children live in an interconnected world that is vastly different from the one that our parents, or even we, knew. In this sea of rapid and radical change, it is reassuring to know that our school counselors will be there to support those children that need it most. They offer each child an indispensable link between the classroom and the real world. School counselors are without a doubt a vital link in our children's emotional and academic educations.

Always willing to lend their sympathetic ear and advice, school counselors are never far at hand when a child needs to express his or her fears, hopes and aspirations. School counselors are helping our children to develop into wonderful young adults each and every day. We should all welcome the opportunity to say congratulations to these unsung protectors of our children.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage all of my colleagues later on today as we take up this bill to honor school counselors across the United States to vote in favor of this resolution, for it is a fine tribute to people whose life's mission is to turn today's children into tomorrow's leaders.

Thank you very much for the time, Mr. Speaker.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 2 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 51 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until 2 p.m.

□ 1400

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. RICHARDSON) at 2 p.m.

PRAYER

Monsignor Stephen J. Rossetti, of The Catholic University of America, offered the following prayer:

Good and gracious God, in these times of difficulty and confusion, our hearts remind us to turn back to You. You are the light; You are the truth. We trust that You will guide our paths during these troubled times; You keep us safe from all evil; and one day, You will lead us safely home. May we open our eyes, now, to see You in our lives; may we open our ears, this day, to hear Your voice. And thus may we follow You with steadfastness and courage. We ask this in the power of Your Spirit

and in Your Word present and among us. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House her approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. DINGELL led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed bills of the following titles in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2949. An act to amend section 1113 of the Social Security Act to provide authority for increased fiscal year 2010 payments for temporary assistance to United States citizens returned from foreign countries, to provide necessary funding to avoid shortfalls in the Medicare cost-sharing program for low-income qualifying individuals, and for other purposes.

S. 2950. An act to extend the pilot program for volunteer groups to obtain criminal history background checks.

The message also announced that pursuant to Public Law 110-315, the Chair, on behalf of the President pro tempore, announces the appointment of the following individuals to be members of the National Advisory Committee on Institutional Quality and Integrity:

Bruce Cole of Indiana, Anne Neal of Wisconsin, and Michael Pokiakoff of Colorado.

INTRODUCING THE FINANCIAL SERVICES INDUSTRY STABILITY ACT OF 2010

(Mr. DINGELL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DINGELL. Madam Speaker, it is not long since a bunch of avaricious, grasping New York bankers caused a replay of 1929 and a major collapse of the American economy. They were too big to fail, and as a result, this Nation has spent hundreds of billions of dollars bailing them out for their wrongdoing. This is intolerable. If we cannot regulate these people, the least we can do is see that they are properly sized.

I urge my colleagues to join me in sponsoring the Financial Services Industry Stability Act of 2010, which I

am introducing today. As Paul Volcker, former chairman of the Federal Reserve, said, the institutions too big to fail would be that they would "be sheltered by access to a Federal safety net in time of crisis." Another former Fed Chair, my dear friend Alan Greenspan, said, "If they're too big to fail, they're too big." Similarly, Mervyn King, governor of the Bank of England, opines, "If some banks are thought to be too big to fail, then, in the words of a distinguished economist, they are too big." I urge my colleagues to help me cut down these avaricious scoundrels to proper size.

THREE OUT OF FOUR AMERICANS THINK STIMULUS MONEY HAS BEEN WASTED

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, where are the jobs? This is the question I continue to ask the liberal majority, since they persist pushing legislation killing jobs. Families are hurting, particularly in South Carolina, where the unemployment rate recently jumped to a gruesome 12.6 percent. The stimulus bill isn't living up to its name, and Americans realize it. According to a CNN poll released yesterday, nearly three out of four Americans think that at least half of the money spent in the Federal stimulus plan has been wasted. Moreover, 63 percent believe projects in the plan were included for political reasons and will have no economic benefit.

I have introduced the National Commission on American Recovery and Reinvestment Act so taxpayers receive adequate answers as to the whereabouts of stimulus funds. I urge Speaker PELOSI to consider this legislation to ensure full accountability of every stimulus dollar spent.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism.

TRIBUTE TO OUR REMARKABLE TROOPS

(Mr. SKELTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. SKELTON. Madam Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to our remarkable troops. Our men and women in uniform represent the best of America. Never is that more apparent than when our forces are mobilized to help people in need, most recently in the wake of the devastating earthquake in Haiti. As of last week, approximately 13,000 military personnel are part of the Haiti relief effort, about 10,000 aboard ship, and 3,000 ashore.

The United States' response to the Haiti earthquake is a whole-of-government effort, with the U.S. Agency for International Development in the lead,

but our military personnel are truly indispensable to the humanitarian response. U.S. military professionals have the logistical, medical, and engineering skills that are desperately needed in a disaster zone.

This critical contribution to the Haiti relief effort comes at a time when the men and women of our military are already being stretched by two wars. But crises rarely happen on a planned timetable, and our troops have demonstrated, once again, their capability to respond admirably whenever disaster strikes.

As any American who has been helped by the National Guard or other U.S. forces during a flood, hurricane, fire, tornado, or other emergency, there is no limit to the compassion, commitment, and dedication of those wearing the American service uniform.

U.S. military servicemembers and their families make tremendous sacrifices, both for our Nation and in working to help people in times of need all over the world. I am so proud of the contribution our heroes in uniform are making to help the people of Haiti, in cooperation with all of the other people in government and non-governmental organizations, and international organizations who are working as partners in the Haiti relief effort.

NATIONAL HEALTH CARE AND THE CONSTITUTION

(Mr. POE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. POE of Texas. Madam Speaker, the United States Constitution is a document to limit the Federal Government. Thomas Jefferson said, "Free government is founded in jealousy, and not in confidence, which (requires) limited constitutions to bind down those whom we are obliged to trust with power."

As the all-seeing eye of the government tries to take care of us, and since it believes we are subjects incapable of taking care of our own health, nowhere in the Constitution is the Federal Government given the enumerated privilege to make a power grab and control the Nation's health. The Constitution sets limits on what dictates of pain the Federal Government is allowed to inflict on the rest of us. George Washington didn't fight the Redcoats so people would be the subjects of a new oppressive, untrustworthy Federal bureaucracy, and the Colonists didn't die in the War of Independence so a health care czar could have the rule over us. It is an unconstitutional abuse of power to nationalize American health care and trust the government with our health.

And that's just the way it is.

PUT AMERICANS BACK TO WORK

(Mr. FLEMING asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. FLEMING. Madam Speaker, the American people are hurting, and Washington is not listening. Over the

past year, the policies of more taxes, runaway spending and record debt have had a chilling effect on job creation across this country. The stock market is languishing, home sales have declined, and unemployment is in double-digits, reaching its highest level in decades.

Last year, President Obama and congressional Democrats promised that the trillion-dollar stimulus plan would create jobs immediately, and unemployment would not rise above 8 percent. Sadly, the only thing the wasteful stimulus bill created was bigger government, with nearly 2.7 million American jobs lost since that promise was made.

The Republican plan provides targeted tax relief for working families and small businesses and will create real jobs, not an illusion of jobs saved, as the administration suggests. It's past time that the President and the Democratic majority get serious about putting Americans back to work.

KEEP TERRORISTS LOCKED UP IN CUBA

(Mr. SMITH of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Madam Speaker, President Obama says that closing the terrorist detention center in Cuba will help America's image abroad and make America safer. This idea is contrary to common sense, nonsensical, irrational, counterintuitive, and dangerous. Since the President has announced his intention to close the military prison, there have been more attempted terrorist attacks, not fewer. The terrorists sense weakness, not strength.

Keeping terrorists locked up in Cuba, rather than transferring them to the U.S. or other countries, is the only way to protect Americans. If they go to other countries, they can be released. If they go to the U.S., they can get constitutional rights, like citizens, which they certainly don't deserve. The administration should treat terrorists like terrorists and leave them in Cuba.

THREE PENDING TRADE AGREEMENTS THAT WILL CREATE JOBS

(Mr. DREIER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, as we all know, there will be a great deal of excitement around the Capitol tomorrow evening. The President of the United States will be delivering his first State of the Union message. Early indications are that he will be talking about the issue that Democrats and Republicans alike and people around this country are talking about, and that is job creation.

We have got an unemployment rate in excess of 10 percent, much higher in

my State of California, and we think—Democrat and Republican alike—that it's a very good idea for the President to be focusing on job creation and economic growth.

Well, Madam Speaker, he has a wonderful opportunity to take what I believe would be the strongest, boldest, most dynamic step towards economic growth, and that is to send to Capitol Hill three pending trade agreements: Panama, Colombia and South Korea. We could create jobs in the manufacturing sector, in the service sector, in the farming sector of our economy if we were to break down the barriers that right now prevent U.S. workers and service providers from being able to have access to that consumer market.

So as we work together in a bipartisan way to create jobs, I encourage the President, Madam Speaker, to send those three trade agreements so that we can create jobs.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, January 22, 2010.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
The Speaker, U.S. Capitol, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, I have the honor to transmit a sealed envelope received from the White House on Friday, January 22, 2010 at 2:53 p.m., and said to contain a message from the President whereby he transmits consistent with Public law 107-108 a report on matters related to support for the interdiction of aircraft engaged in illicit drug trafficking.

With best wishes, I am,
Sincerely,

LORRAINE C. MILLER,
Clerk of the House.

UNITED STATES ASSISTANCE FOR THE INTERDICTION OF AIRCRAFT ENGAGED IN ILICIT DRUG TRAFFICKING—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 111-89)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Consistent with the authorities related to official immunity in the interdiction of aircraft engaged in illicit drug trafficking (Public Law 107-108, 22 U.S.C. 2291-4), as amended, and in order to keep the Congress fully informed, I am providing a report by my Administration. This report includes matters related to support for the interdiction

of aircraft engaged in illicit drug trafficking.

BARACK OBAMA,
THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 22, 2010.*

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote incurs objection under clause 6 of rule XX.

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken after 6:30 p.m. today.

□ 1415

HONORING LESTER FLATT

Ms. WOOLSEY. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 583) expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that Lester Flatt has made an invaluable contribution to American art as both a songwriter and a performer, leaving an indelible legacy in bluegrass music, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 583

Whereas Lester Flatt was born on June 19, 1914, and was raised in the region of Sparta, Tennessee;

Whereas Lester Flatt began playing guitar and singing in local churches at a young age;

Whereas Lester Flatt began his career with Charlie Monroe and the Kentucky Pardners in North Carolina in the early 1940s;

Whereas in 1945, Lester Flatt was invited by Bill Monroe to play rhythm guitar and sing with Monroe's band on the Grand Ole Opry;

Whereas Lester Flatt, Earl Scruggs, Chubby Wise, Howard Watts, and Bill Monroe are widely credited with the creation of bluegrass music through their band, Bill Monroe and the Bluegrass Boys;

Whereas Lester Flatt later joined with Earl Scruggs to create the band Flatt and Scruggs and the Foggy Mountain Boys, which remains one of the most influential bands in bluegrass music;

Whereas in 1969, Lester Flatt parted with Scruggs to form the band Nashville Grass, with whom he performed until shortly before his death on May 11, 1979;

Whereas in 1991, Lester Flatt, along with Bill Monroe and Earl Scruggs, became an inaugural member of the International Bluegrass Music Hall of Fame; and

Whereas Lester Flatt is widely regarded as one of the greatest bluegrass musicians and singers of all time, writing dozens of songs that are considered bluegrass classics: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the House of Representatives that Lester Flatt has made an invaluable contribution to American art as both a songwriter and a performer, leaving an indelible legacy in bluegrass music.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) and the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. WOOLSEY. Madam Speaker, I request 5 legislative days during which Members may revise and extend and insert extraneous material on H. Res. 583 into the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Madam Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

I rise today to support House Resolution 583, which recognizes Lester Flatt's invaluable contributions to American art as both a songwriter and a performer. One of nine children, Lester Flatt was born on June 9, 1914, and raised in Sparta, Tennessee. As a singer and a guitarist, Lester Flatt is widely considered one of the founding fathers of bluegrass music.

He learned to sing and to play the guitar in local churches. As a member of the legendary Flatt and Scruggs and the Foggy Mountain Boys, Flatt not only popularized bluegrass music, he transformed the music genre from regional to national. Bluegrass music itself, Madam Speaker, originated in the early 1600s as an American art form of immigrants as they came to America. Irish, Scottish, English and African American cultures have played a major part in developing bluegrass music.

The music started in rural areas and in small towns describing life in the hills or on the farms. Eventually this sound became popularized and Lester Flatt emerged from Tennessee as our Nation's premiere bluegrass artist.

With Bill Monroe's Bluegrass Boys in the mid-1940s, Lester helped bring national acclaim to bluegrass music with the Original Bluegrass Band. Later in Flatt's career he teamed up with Earl Scruggs to create the Foggy Mountain Boys in 1948. This group went on to achieve longstanding success and prestige unprecedented in the bluegrass music world. Parting with Earl in 1969, Lester continued successfully with his own "Nashville Grass" until shortly before his death in 1979.

Though he reached tremendous heights across the Nation, Flatt preferred to perform in small towns. He, along with two others, became inaugural members of the International Bluegrass Music Hall of Fame.

Madam Speaker, I want to once again congratulate Lester Flatt on his artistic accomplishments and honor his extraordinary life. I thank Congressman LINCOLN DAVIS from Tennessee for bringing this resolution forward today.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today in support of House Resolution 583, expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that Lester Flatt has made an invaluable contribu-

tion to the American art as both a songwriter and a performer, and has left an indelible legacy on bluegrass music.

Born in Overton County, Tennessee, in 1914, by age seven he had learned to play the guitar and sang in his church choir. He began entertaining locally and began to pursue a music career when rheumatoid arthritis forced him to quit his job in a local silk mill. As has been stated, he started in 1945 with the Blue Grass Boys, then later with the Foggy Mountain Boys and then finally with the Nashville Grass.

He passed away, but his voice and unique bluegrass style will always be remembered. Lester Flatt and the Bluegrass Boys are credited with the introduction of bluegrass music to this Nation. Bluegrass music is a unique form of American roots music and is considered a sub-genre of the country music scene.

Bluegrass was especially popular in the rural areas of this country, and it's often referred to as the Kentucky bluegrass after Bill Monroe, who was from Kentucky and a member of the Bluegrass Boys. Bluegrass music is a uniquely American art form and Lester Flatt helped to introduce this music to the Nation. Lester Flatt left an indelible legacy in bluegrass music and in the American art, and I ask my colleagues to support this resolution.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Madam Speaker, I'm pleased to recognize the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DAVIS), the sponsor of this legislation, for as much time as he may consume.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. I thank the gentlelady for yielding time, and I will make some very brief comments.

As we look across America, we look at our rivers, our streams, our oceans and our lakes, the scenic mountains of Tennessee, the scenic mountains, obviously the Rocky Mountains and the Appalachians. Our artists that will paint portraits and paintings on canvas, our literature, through great authors of our time, our character, as a Nation, our heritage, our family traditions, our family values, and, yes, our music are part of this great American heritage.

Our music, music of those like Flatt and Scruggs that, when I was a child growing up, listening to a radio operated by a battery on a Saturday night was one of the special times when the family got together. But certainly for this particular occasion, for that hour-long session, the "Grand Ole Opry," we would hear such performers as Bashful Oswald and Stringbean and, yes, Flatt and Scruggs, that became an entity in the mid-forties.

Lester Flatt was born in Sparta, Tennessee, in a district that I now represent in White County. And from that, he basically learned his art in church by singing with the choir. He learned his art by self-teaching and by instructions from others in the community of how to play different instruments. And

he became someone that those of us who loved mountain music, who loved the mountain music, loved to hear him. The songs that he sang, the songs that he composed—most he sang himself, and some were sung by others. But he gave us, all of us who live in America and all of those of us who love bluegrass music on a Saturday night, or Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, Friday and gospel music on Sunday night that's bluegrass style, kind of have a great deal of respect and reverence for Lester Flatt.

It is my honor as a Member of Congress and it is my honor as the Congressman who represents the area where he was born and later moved to North Carolina and Kentucky to perform to audiences that were blessed with his voice, which was unique and his music, which was unique and the three-finger roll that was brought by the banjo to make that music even better. So it's my honor today to recognize this giant who was one of the first three that became a member of the Hall of Fame in 1991, and it's fitting that he did. So it's fitting that we here today honor this giant of bluegrass music.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. After hearing the eloquence of the gentleman from Tennessee, I'm embarrassed to admit that the only thing I think of, when I hear Lester Flatt's name, I have to think of "The Beverly Hillbillies."

But with that, I'd like to yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. COBLE).

Mr. COBLE. I thank the gentleman from Utah for yielding. I appreciate that. And you're on the money: "The Beverly Hillbillies," indeed, were a very significant role that they played: Lester Flatt, Earl Scruggs and the Foggy Mountain Boys brought to you by Martha White. Those introductory words were disseminated, Madam Speaker, across the airwaves throughout Tennessee, southeastern United States and beyond, introducing what, in my opinion, was the world's premiere bluegrass aggregation during that era, specifically the fifties and the sixties.

I realize that the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee can claim, and rightly so, that Lester Flatt was his constituent, but I would be remiss if I didn't remind him again that Earl Scruggs, the world's premiere 5-string banjoist is a native Carolinian, although not a resident in the district I represent.

In addition to Lester and Earl, Paul, Josh and Jake completed the starting five. But when Lester Flatt, Earl Scruggs and the Foggy Mountain Boys performed, whether on radio, television or in live concert, Americana was on parade because bluegrass music, after all, is America's music. These men, all superb musicians, were celebrities in their own right, but they did not conduct themselves as celebrities. They were not unlike our next-door neighbor or the guy down the street.

Finally, I think it's fitting and appropriate that this House of Representatives recognizes today that Lester Flatt has made an invaluable contribution to American art as both a songwriter and a performer, leaving an indelible legacy in bluegrass music.

Ms. WOOLSEY. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. We have no more speakers, so I urge my colleagues to vote favorably on this particular resolution.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RAHALL. Madam Speaker, I fully support recognizing legendary bluegrass singer and songwriter Lester Flatt for his many contributions to American music.

Music is a tradition that most of us in West Virginia have enjoyed our entire lives. Lester Flatt is a great example of the amazing collection of musical talent in Appalachia. This resolution supports the history and traditions of our region and brings awareness to the talents of Bluegrass Musicians.

Lester Flatt was an acclaimed guitarist, lead singer and a leader in making Blue Grass music what it is today. Most famous for his long career with Bill Monroe, Earl Scruggs and the Blue Grass Boys; Lester Flatt and his legendary sounds and strong rhythm and guitar playing helped to create the unique and memorable sound of modern Bluegrass.

A southern West Virginia Bluegrass legend Everett Lilly, originally from Clear Creek near Beckley, had the opportunity to tour with Lester Flatt in the early 1950s, and participated in classic duet recordings with Lester Flatt.

In southern West Virginia we celebrate not only famous Bluegrass Musicians like Lester Flatt and Everett Lilly, but all of our talented musicians through efforts led by the West Virginia Humanities Council and the Music Hall of Fame exhibit at Tamarack. The permanent exhibit at Tamarack in Beckley, WV houses memorabilia and recorded works of Mountain State musicians of the last 50 years and is accompanied by a concert series and a variety of educational programs.

Another exciting initiative is The WV Music Hall of Fame's Traveling Museum which is a collaborated effort between the Humanities Council and the WV Department of Education. The exhibits showcase the variety of music that has come from the Mountain State, from opera and jazz to gospel, traditional, country, bluegrass, blues and rock 'n' roll. While visiting the Traveling Museum, you can view an interactive county by county map of West Virginia's musical history, listen to a variety of music and even make your own CD.

I fully encouraged this partnership and commend The Hall of Fame on a remarkable job in its first few years.

Music was the missing link to West Virginia's premiere arts venue, Tamarack. The Hall of Fame and Tamarack are natural partners. I encourage my fellow West Virginians to support our State and our regions' great musicians and organizations—all working to keep our arts and humanities heritage alive and well in our communities, schools, and lives.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H. Res. 583, which recognizes Lester Flatt's invaluable contributions to American art as both a songwriter and a performer, and I yield back the remainder of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 583, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL MENTORING MONTH

Ms. WOOLSEY. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 990) expressing support for designation of January 2010 as "National Mentoring Month".

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 990

Whereas mentoring is a longstanding tradition in which a dependable, caring adult provides guidance, support, and encouragement to facilitate a young person's social, emotional, and cognitive development;

Whereas continued research on mentoring shows that formal, high-quality mentoring focused on developing the competence and character of the mentee promotes positive outcomes, such as improved academic achievement, self-esteem, social skills, and career development;

Whereas further research on mentoring provides strong evidence that mentoring successfully reduces substance use and abuse, academic failure, and delinquency;

Whereas mentoring, in addition to preparing young people for school, work, and life, is extremely rewarding for those serving as mentors;

Whereas more than 4,700 mentoring programs in communities of all sizes across the United States focus on building strong, effective relationships between mentors and mentees;

Whereas approximately 3,000,000 young people in the United States are in solid mentoring relationships due to the remarkable vigor, creativity, and resourcefulness of the thousands of mentoring programs in communities throughout the Nation;

Whereas in spite of the progress made to increase mentoring, the United States has a serious "mentoring gap", with nearly 15,000,000 young people in need of mentors;

Whereas mentoring partnerships between the public and private sectors bring State and local leaders together to support mentoring programs by preventing duplication of efforts, offering training in industry best practices, and making the most of limited resources to benefit young people in the United States;

Whereas the designation of January 2010 as "National Mentoring Month" will help call attention to the critical role mentors play in helping young people realize their potential;

Whereas a month-long celebration of mentoring will encourage more individuals and organizations, including schools, businesses, nonprofit organizations, faith institutions, and foundations, to become engaged in mentoring across the United States; and

Whereas National Mentoring Month will, most significantly, build awareness of mentoring and encourage more people to become mentors and help close the mentoring gap in the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) supports the designation of "National Mentoring Month";

(2) recognizes with gratitude the contributions of the millions of caring adults and students who are already volunteering as mentors and encourages more adults and students to volunteer as mentors; and

(3) encourages the people of the United States to observe National Mentoring Month with appropriate ceremonies and activities that promote awareness of, and volunteer involvement with, youth mentoring.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) and the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. WOOLSEY. Madam Speaker, I request 5 legislative days during which Members may revise and extend and insert extraneous material on H. Res. 990 into the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Madam Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 990, which recognizes January as National Mentoring Month. Today we acknowledge and thank the millions of caring adults and students who volunteer as mentors, and we commend their efforts. National Mentoring Month serves as a great opportunity to encourage others to get involved mentoring and volunteering their time. Mentors directly improve the lives of those who are in need of guidance by providing support, care, and encouragement to facilitate a younger person's development in life.

Research consistently proves, Madam Speaker, that mentors bolster academic achievement, self-esteem, social skills, and career development. In addition to these positive outcomes, mentoring reduces delinquency, substance abuse, and academic failure. Mentoring, whether it is for school work or life in general, helps young people realize that a better life is attainable, and it helps them to obtain the tools they need to succeed.

Today, there are over 4,700 mentoring programs in communities all across the United States serving approximately 3 million young people. This country, however, is in need of more mentors to help fill the gap and reach the nearly 15 million young people who would benefit from a positive, solid mentoring relationship. As a Nation, we must continue to encourage volunteers to invest their human capital in our youth. Through nonprofit government and private sector partnerships, we can expand mentoring.

□ 1430

The National Mentoring Month is a reminder to reinvest our energy towards mentoring relationships. By building awareness on this issue, we

can encourage more people to serve as mentors.

Madam Speaker, once again, I express my support, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today in support of House Resolution 990, expressing support for the designation of January 2010 as National Mentoring Month, and I am glad we are doing it before it's over.

National Mentoring Month celebrates mentors who are positively impacting the lives of people and highlights the need for additional mentors to make themselves available for America's youth.

Mentoring is a structured and trusting relationship that brings young people together with caring individuals who offer guidance, support, and encouragement, all aimed at developing the confidence and character of the mentee.

A mentor is an adult who, along with parents, provides a young person with support, counsel, friendship, and positive reinforcement.

By all estimates, almost 18 million young people—nearly half of the population of young people between the ages of 10 and 18—live in situations that put them at risk of not living up to their potential. Without immediate intervention by caring adults, they can make choices that not only undermine their futures but, ultimately, the economic and social well-being of our Nation.

Research shows that formal, high-quality mentoring focused on developing the competence and character of the mentee promotes positive outcomes such as improved academic achievement, self-esteem, career development, and social skills. By honoring mentors and mentoring programs, we recognize the importance of mentoring programs implemented in our local schools and communities. We also draw attention to the components of a quality program, including appropriate screening of potential mentors and careful matching of youth with adults who have a genuine interest in providing guidance and being exemplary role models.

Today, thanks to the commitment and dedication of mentoring advocates, 3 million young people are now enjoying mentoring's many benefits through school-based, faith-based, and community organizations. It's a six-fold increase in formal mentoring relationships since the early 1990s.

Today we recognize the contribution mentors make to the lives of the Nation's youth. The time adults take to serve as a mentor provides children and young adults with a positive adult example and support system. Adult mentors should be recognized for their contributions and efforts, and, therefore, I urge Members to support this resolution.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to recognize the sponsor of

this legislation, the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Congresswoman MCCOLLUM).

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Madam Speaker, as co-chair of the Congressional Mentoring Caucus, I rise today in strong support for designating January 2010 as National Mentoring Month. Thank you to Chairman MILLER and Chairwoman WOOLSEY for bringing this legislation to the floor. I would also like to thank the other chairs in the Mentoring Caucus, Mrs. DAVIS of California and Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, who are original cosponsors of this legislation.

We all have an important role to play in the lives of young people around us. Our entire community needs to be part of the process in shaping young lives to become responsible citizens. When caring adults make connections and provide guidance to our youth, it makes a positive impact on their lives.

A local newspaper in Minnesota recently ran an article about the enormous difference mentoring makes in someone's life. All of us have experienced that personally. For far too many young people and children, they just might not have a strong adult presence in their lives. Mentors encourage the development of strong characters and healthy identities. That's a fact. We have the data to back that up.

Studies show that young adults who have mentors are less likely to experiment with drugs, skip school, or become involved in criminal activity; and at the same time, students are more likely to be confident, make good grades and graduate from high school and improve their self-esteem when they have a mentor. When these students grow up, they are more likely to be better parents, better neighbors, in general, better citizens.

Nationally, there is an estimated mentoring gap of 15 million at-risk young people who need and who would benefit greatly from a mentor. In Minnesota alone, there are more than 250,000 students who fall into this gap.

I sponsored this resolution to help raise awareness of this gap and of the many benefits of mentoring for both the mentee and the mentor and to encourage more people to volunteer their time and to invest in a child's well-being and their future.

Mentorship does not end with childhood. Whether you're asking a neighbor to assist you after you've had your first child or you're seeking a person at work or your place of worship to guide you through these tough decisions, mentoring benefits people of all ages.

My life has personally been filled with many mentors from my childhood right up until today. Congressman Bruce Vento—whose seat I now hold—mentored me from my early days in politics until I decided to run for Congress. And you never know where you might find a mentor. Many in this Chamber might have been surprised that one of my closest mentors was Congressman Henry Hyde from Illinois. He helped me understand the history

and the greatness of this institution, and he taught me by example that elected officials should always, always respect one another in debate and always respect one another especially when we disagree.

I encourage all of my colleagues to look for opportunities to mentor our youth, and they can start by doing that today by voting "yes" on this resolution.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 990, "Expressing support for designation of January 2010 as "National Mentoring Month" and for other purposes, introduced by my distinguished colleague from Minnesota, Representative MCCOLLUM. "National Mentoring Month," since January 2002, has been a national initiative and an annual campaign focusing attention on the need of mentors to mentees, and to promote youth mentoring with the message that, "If we—individuals, businesses, government agencies, schools, faith communities, and nonprofits—can work together to increase the number of mentors, we assure brighter futures for our young people." This annual initiative and campaign is spearheaded by the Harvard School of Public Health, MENTOR, and the Corporation for National and Community Service.

President Barack Obama, former Secretary of State General Colin Powell, former Presidents Bill Clinton and George W. Bush, Arizona Senator JOHN MCCAIN, music producer Quincy Jones, poet Maya Angelou, music recording artist Usher, and actor Clint Eastwood, have all endorsed the campaigns for National Mentoring Month. A highlight of the campaign is the "Thank You Mentor Day," in which mentees thank and honor their mentors for their mentorship. Mentees are encouraged to reach out to their mentors to express their appreciation. Mentees also have the options of posting a tribute to their mentor or mentors on WhoMentoredYou.org, to become a mentor in their local communities, and/or make a financial contribution to a mentoring program.

Dr. Jay A. Winsten, as associate dean at the Harvard School of Public Health stated that, "Youth mentoring is a highly effective public health intervention. Research has shown that programs that rely on volunteer mentors can play a powerful role in reducing drug abuse and youth violence, while greatly enhancing a young person's prospects for leading a healthy and productive life." Mentoring is a long-standing tradition where mentors provide guidance, support, encouragement and aid in promoting positive outcomes, in the areas of career and social development in helping young people realize and reach their full potential.

I agree with Ms. Nicola Goren, the Director of the Corporation, in the regard that, "Our nation's success depends on helping every child succeed and reach their full potential in life and that mentoring strengthens our nation's economic and social well-being by influencing the life choices of young people with a caring adult."

More than 4,700 mentoring programs in communities of all sizes across the United States focus on building strong relationships and 3,000,000 young people are in mentoring programs throughout the United States. In making January a month-long celebration of mentoring, it will call action to the important

role and responsibility that all mentors play in the shaping of the young people of America, and will encourage more individuals and organizations to become engaged in this nationwide effort across this great Nation in building awareness of this national initiative and campaign for mentorship for our youth. I would like to personally encourage all the members of Congress to either become a mentor or to encourage a friend or family member today to become a mentor, not only for our youth, but for this country.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Madam Speaker, I urge adoption of this resolution, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support House Resolution 990, which recognizes January as National Mentoring Month.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 990.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

CONGRATULATING MESSIAH COLLEGE

Ms. WOOLSEY. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 1030) congratulating Messiah College men's and women's soccer teams on winning the 2009 NCAA Division III national championships.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 1030

Whereas Messiah College men's and women's soccer teams won the 2009 NCAA Division III championships on December 5, 2009, against Calvin College and Washington University-St. Louis;

Whereas the 2009 championship was the seventh national championship for Messiah College men's soccer team since 2000 and the third national championship for the women's team since 2000;

Whereas Messiah College is the only college in the NCAA to win both the men's and women's soccer national championship in the same year;

Whereas Messiah College is a Christian liberal arts college that was founded in 1909 and is located in Grantham, Pennsylvania;

Whereas Messiah College has 22 intercollegiate athletic teams that have won 11 NCAA national championships; and

Whereas Messiah College encourages athletes to develop their athletic excellence and to develop character: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) congratulates Messiah College men's and women's soccer teams on winning the 2009 NCAA Division III national championships; and

(2) recognizes Messiah College for excellence in academics, athletics, and character.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) and the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. WOOLSEY. Madam Speaker, I request 5 legislative days during which Members may revise and extend and insert extraneous material on House Resolution 1030 into the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Messiah College men's and women's soccer teams on winning the 2009 NCAA Division III national championship against Calvin College and Washington State University-St. Louis, respectively.

Messiah is the only NCAA institution to claim men's and women's soccer national championships in the same season. Messiah College men's team won their national championship game 2-0 and provided the men's team with its seventh national title in the last 10 seasons—an NCAA Division III all-time best, to say the least.

Messiah College women's team collected its third national championship and second championship in a row capping a 3-year run in which the Falcons' only loss was to Wheaton College in the 2007 title match. After outscoring their opponents by a 20-1 margin in last year's NCAA tournament, the Messiah College women posted just seven goals in their final five games this year winning four contests 1-0, one in double overtime.

Congratulations are in order for head coaches Brad McCarty and Scott Frey. McCarty was recently named head coach of the Messiah men's soccer program and became the seventh head coach in the program's storied 42-year history. Before becoming head coach, McCarty helped Messiah to five of its six national championships as an assistant coach.

As for the women's coach, Scott Frey has compiled a record of 156 wins, 12 losses, and 8 ties in his 8 seasons with the women's soccer program. Winning over 90 percent of his games, he was placed on the Winningest Active Coaches list.

The success of both the men's and women's soccer teams is a testament to Messiah College's commitment to excellence. They have won 10 national soccer championships combined in the past 10 years.

Not only does Messiah College excel athletically, but they are also a premier academic institution. The school

is a nationally ranked private Christian college with a socially, denominationally, and politically diverse student body of 2,800 undergraduate students. Located in Grant-ham, Pennsylvania, Messiah College awards bachelor of arts and bachelor of science degrees in more than 55 majors.

Madam Speaker, once again, I congratulate the Messiah College soccer program for their success, and I thank Representative PLATTS for bringing this bill forward.

I urge my colleagues to support House Resolution 1030, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of House Resolution 1030 congratulating Messiah College men's and women's soccer teams on winning the 2009 NCAA Division III national championships.

Messiah College is a private Christian college that was founded in 1909 and is located in Grantham, Pennsylvania. Messiah's mission is "to educate men and women toward maturity of intellect, character, and Christian faith in preparation for lives of service, leadership, and reconciliation in church and society." The college's mission reflects its dedication to developing students' character, as well as their intellect.

Messiah College offers 60 majors in five different schools and has been ranked as one of the top 10 best colleges for comprehensive bachelor's degrees in the north by U.S. News and World Report. Messiah College obviously boasts an excellent athletic program. Of the 22 intercollegiate athletic teams at Messiah, the men's and women's soccer teams are the college's two most winning teams. The Messiah College Falcons, both their men's and women's soccer teams, won the 2009 NCAA Division III national championship on December 5. This victory was the seventh national championship since 2000 for the men and the third since 2000 for the women. Messiah claimed the third and only men's and women's dual national championships in NCAA history.

In the championship games, head coaches Brad McCarty and Scott Frey led the men's and women's soccer teams to a 2-0 victory against Calvin College and a 1-0 victory against Washington University of St. Louis. Jared Clugston was voted the most valuable defense player, and Geoff Pezon won the most valuable offensive title at the tournament.

So I congratulate Messiah College, the men's and women's teams, and I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this resolution.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support House Resolution 1030 congratulating Messiah College men's and women's soccer teams on winning the 2009 NCAA Division III national championships, and I yield back the remainder of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1030.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1445

NATIONAL SCHOOL COUNSELING WEEK

Ms. WOOLSEY. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 1029) expressing support for designation of the week of February 1 through February 5, 2010, as "National School Counseling Week".

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 1029

Whereas the American School Counselor Association has declared the week of February 1 through February 5, 2010, as "National School Counseling Week";

Whereas the House of Representatives has recognized the importance of school counseling through the inclusion of elementary and secondary school counseling programs in the last reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965;

Whereas school counselors have long advocated that the education system of the United States must provide equitable opportunities for all students;

Whereas school counselors have long emphasized the importance of personal and social development in academic achievement;

Whereas school counselors help develop well-rounded students by guiding them through their academic, personal, social, and career development;

Whereas school counselors play a vital role in ensuring that students are aware of financial aid and college opportunities;

Whereas school counselors may encourage students to pursue challenging academic courses to prepare them for college majors and careers in the science, technology, engineering, and mathematics fields;

Whereas school counselors provide support for students whose family members have been deployed to conflicts overseas;

Whereas school counselors help students cope with serious and common challenges of growing up, including peer pressure, mental health issues, school violence, disciplinary problems, and problems in the home;

Whereas school counselors are also instrumental in helping students, teachers, and parents deal with personal trauma and community and national tragedies;

Whereas school counselors are among the few professionals in a school building that are trained in both education and mental health;

Whereas, despite the important contributions of school counselors to student success, counseling positions are not always protected when local budgets are cut, especially in tough economic times;

Whereas the average student-to-counselor ratio in America's public schools, 475-to-1, is almost double the 250-to-1 ratio recommended by the American School Counselor Association, the American Counseling Association, and other organizations;

Whereas the celebration of "National School Counseling Week" would increase awareness of the important and necessary role school counselors play in the lives of students in the United States; and

Whereas the week of February 1 through February 5, 2010, would be an appropriate week to designate as "National School Counseling Week": Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the United States House of Representatives—

(1) honors and recognizes the contributions of school counselors to the success of students in our Nation's elementary and secondary schools; and

(2) encourages the people of the United States to observe "National School Counseling Week" with appropriate ceremonies and activities that promote awareness of the crucial role school counselors play in preparing students for fulfilling lives as contributing members of society.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) and the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP) each will control 20 minutes.

The gentlewoman from California is recognized.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. WOOLSEY. Madam Speaker, I request 5 legislative days during which Members may revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material on H. Res. 1029 into the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Madam Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 1029, which recognizes the impact that school counselors have in students' lives throughout the country. It encourages the observance of February 1 through 5 as National School Counseling Week.

School counselors play an essential role in students', teachers', and families' lives. National data show that school counselors improve teacher quality, bolster student achievement, and lower dropout rates. Additionally, research demonstrates that students who receive social and emotional support and other services carried out by school counselors achieve higher academic results.

Our education system employs school counselors at all levels, in elementary, middle, and high school, as well as in district supervisory positions. The educational backgrounds of school counselors qualify them to work with students to address their academic, personal, social, and career development needs. Through the implementation of a school counseling program, counselors offer a range of services to students. They also offer these services to parents, guardians, other school staff, and the community at large. School counselors assist with curriculum design and implementation, offer individual guidance and counseling, and other intervention activities that meet immediate student needs. Examples include education on mental health

issues, school violence prevention, social and career skills training, college guidance and preparation, as well as conflict resolution.

Day in and day out, Madam Speaker, school counselors work tirelessly to provide academic, college preparatory, career, and emotional support to our children. Through their leadership and advocacy, school counselors strive to foster healthy school environments that promote equity and access to quality educational experiences for every student.

I thank the American School Counselor Association and the National Education Association for supporting this important resolution and the work of counselors in our schools. National School Counseling Week reminds us that the crucial role counselors play is absolutely important in every student's life.

Madam Speaker, again, I support this resolution and thank Congresswoman LINDA SÁNCHEZ for bringing this resolution forward. I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Madam Speaker, again, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of House Resolution 1029 that expresses support for the designation of the week of February 1 through February 5 2010 as National School Counseling Week, even though that is only 5 days. But I guess that is a school week.

School counselors serve as a valuable resource to students across the Nation. School counselors assist students with the transition from secondary education to higher education or the workforce. They help students cope with trauma and difficult family issues, assist students and teachers in dealing with behavioral problems, and they serve as a resource for students dealing with the challenges of becoming adults.

School counselors also serve as a resource for parents and educators. They assist parents in communicating with their kids, and provide parents with important information to help their kids transition to higher education or the workforce. They work with teachers and parents to help students explore their potential and set realistic education and career goals. They often serve as a third party to mediate between parent-teacher or student-teacher or parent-student relationships.

National School Counseling Week highlights the importance of school counselors and the valuable assistance that they provide students, parents, and teachers. This year's theme is "Celebrate School Counseling." The theme aims to focus public attention on the unique contributions of professional school counselors.

I spent far many too years of my life teaching in the public school system. I have known many counselors, and I have appreciated their efforts and have respected their efforts and their goals even as I have harassed them on their particular jobs.

With that, I express my sincere gratitude to all school counselors. I recognize their contribution to our Nation's youth. I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to recognize the gentlewoman from California (Congresswoman LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ), the sponsor of the legislation, for as much time as she may consume.

Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California. I want to thank my colleague from California (Ms. WOOLSEY).

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of House Resolution 1029 and support the goals of National School Counseling Week. I want to thank Chairman GEORGE MILLER and Ranking Member JOHN KLINE, as well as Representative VERN EHLERS, for their support of this resolution.

I introduced this resolution to recognize the tireless efforts of a group of professionals who have dedicated themselves to children and to their education: school counselors.

I wish to take this opportunity to recognize a few of the diligent and hardworking school counselors from California's 39th District. Angela Castellanos of Santa Fe High School in Whittier, California, and Alex Paredes of Southeast High School in South Gate, California, are just two examples of counselors who do exceptional work every single day to help our students reach their highest potential. It is because of their unending dedication and the dedication of counselors like Angela and Alex that children across our country succeed in becoming engineers, doctors and, yes, even Members of Congress.

School counselors play a vital role in the development of our students, not just on academic, but on social and personal levels as well. Unfortunately, there simply aren't enough of them. Counselors often find themselves the casualty of budget cuts. In California, for example, the student-to-counselor ratio is a dismal 945 students to one counselor. That's 945 students to one counselor, almost four times the recommended ratio.

Our secondary school counselors work vigorously to increase graduation rates, identify problems in our schools, and improve morale by inspiring students to challenge themselves and explore new opportunities.

Primary counselors often help identify students with health problems or disabilities that interfere with learning. They also help youngsters to cope with traumatic events, from moving to a new school to the death of a parent.

Our counselors do amazing and often unrecognized work. Our communities are strengthened by the students who are championed by their school counselors. I urge my colleagues to support this effort to recognize the outstanding work that counselors do to ensure that our children's future is full of promise. I thank again my colleague.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I have no other speakers. Is the gentlelady from California ready to yield back?

Ms. WOOLSEY. I am ready to yield back.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Then with that, I urge adoption of this resolution, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H. Res. 1029, which recognizes the impact that school counselors have in students' lives and encourages the observation of February 1 through February 5 as National School Counseling Week.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, today I rise in support of House Resolution 1029. This resolution designates the week of February 1 through February 5 as "National School Counseling Week." It is extremely vital that we recognize those very people who mentor and motivate our youth to do their very best. Our Nation's school counselors work everyday to ensure every child has opportunities for personal and educational growth. With very little resources, they help some kids stay in school and help others cope with personal tragedies. They help our children dream big and prepare for careers from manufacturing to medicine to becoming tomorrow's future leaders. Thus it is vital we support and honor those who play key roles in our children's success and life.

The national "drop out" rate has increased to 6.2 million students in the United States ranging in age from 16 and 24. This pressing issue is of utter importance and should be addressed with urgency as it pertains to our youth. These statistics are hard to believe. Only half of the high school students in the Nation's 50 largest cities are graduating in four years. Marguerite Kondracke, president and CEO of America's Promise, says that each year dropouts represent \$320 billion in lost lifetime earning potential. The difference in lifetime salary for a dropout and a high school graduate is about \$300,000. This is why it is really important for students to have counselors who are instrumental in encouraging students to stay in school and motivate them to succeed.

This subject is near and dear to my heart. In Houston, we have one of the highest drop out rates in the country. Houston Independent School District's, HISD's, dropout rate is at least 18 percent. It is one of the biggest challenges we are having. Many students need the extra push to truly value education and to stay in school. In the current global economy, having at least a high school diploma is a critical step for avoiding poverty, and a college degree is a prerequisite for a well-paying job. The costs of dropping out of high school today are substantial and have risen over time, especially for young men, who find it almost impossible to earn an adequate income to take care of themselves and their families.

By contrast, adults with high school diplomas contribute major fiscal benefits to the country over their lifetime. The combined lifetime fiscal benefits—including the payment of payroll, Federal, and State income taxes—could amount to more than \$250,000 per graduated student. Such a public fiscal benefit more than outweighs the estimated cost of enrolling a student who has dropped out.

The average counselor-to-student ratio in America's public schools is a mere one 1 to

475, a ratio that means school counselors must work extremely hard to meet the individual educational needs of students. Yet, despite their limited supply, counselors are always there in a pinch: counselors are instrumental in helping children and their families cope with trauma, whether a natural disaster or a family death.

As many of you know, professional secondary school counselors are also an integral part of the effort to increase graduation rates. School counselors identify potential problems early in a student's academic career and make sure that they are addressed before students become overwhelmed and drop out. School counselors also inspire children to achieve better futures for themselves and their communities through education.

Once again, I urge my colleagues to support this resolution in honoring our school counselors who do so much and rarely get recognition for their hard work.

Ms. WOOLSEY. I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1029.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CERVICAL HEALTH AWARENESS MONTH

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 1011) recognizing the importance of cervical health and of detecting cervical cancer during its earliest stages and supporting the goals and ideals of Cervical Health Awareness Month.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 1011

Whereas approximately 11,270 women were diagnosed with, and approximately 4,070 women died from cervical cancer in the United States in 2009;

Whereas cervical cancer occurs most often in Hispanic women, at a rate that is more than twice what is seen in non-Hispanic White women;

Whereas African-American women develop cervical cancer about 50 percent more often than non-Hispanic White women;

Whereas half of the women diagnosed with the disease are between 35 and 55 years of age, and approximately 20 percent of diagnoses are made in women older than 65;

Whereas cervical cancer is usually a slow-growing cancer that may not have symptoms, and is primarily caused by the human papillomavirus (HPV), but can be detected by Papanicolaou tests (Pap tests) or other early detection tests;

Whereas the earlier cervical cancer is detected the better chance a woman has of surviving cervical cancer;

Whereas cervical cancer patients and survivors have shown tremendous courage and determination in the face of adversity: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) supports the goals and ideals of Cervical Health Awareness Month;

(2) recognizes the importance of good cervical health and of detecting cervical cancer during its earliest stages;

(3) urges healthcare advocates to continue to raise public awareness about cervical cancer and the importance of early detection;

(4) urges the people of the United States to learn about cervical cancer and its causes, most notably human papillomavirus (HPV), and the importance of early detection; and

(5) recognizes the patients and survivors of cervical cancer and their families for their tremendous courage and determination.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rules, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I yield to myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support of H. Res. 1011, supporting the goals and ideals of Cervical Health Awareness Month.

According to the American Cancer Society, over 11,000 American women will receive the news that they have cervical cancer this year, and over 4,000 women will die due to this disease.

The earlier cervical cancer is detected, the better chance a woman has of surviving. Cellular changes that precede cervical cancer can be detected by Pap tests or other early detection methods. With early detection, women can get treatment that prevents the disease from progressing to a later stage.

As a result of the increase in prevention, we are beginning to see a decrease in the number of women who get and die from cervical cancer. But we still have more work to do, especially in the minority populations. African American women and Hispanic women, for example, are 50 percent more likely to develop cervical cancer than non-Hispanic white women and are also more likely to die from the disease.

And that is why this resolution, Madam Speaker, before us today is so important. We must increase awareness of cervical cancer and promote testing to ensure early detection so that we can further reduce the numbers of women who succumb to cervical cancer every year.

The resolution before us today supports the goals and ideals of Cervical Health Awareness Month. It acknowledges the importance of early detection as a crucial tool in treating and

surviving the disease, and supports heightened awareness about prevention of cervical cancer.

I want to thank my colleague, the sponsor of the legislation, Representative DEBBIE HALVORSON from Illinois, for her work in raising this important issue. I urge my colleagues to pass this resolution, Madam Speaker.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I wish to thank the chairman of the Subcommittee on Health of the Energy and Commerce Committee for bringing this important piece of legislation to the floor. And I am a cosponsor of H. Res. 1011, sponsored by Representative DEBORAH HALVORSON from the State of Illinois.

This month, January, is national Cervical Health Awareness Month, and it is important, it is fitting that we highlight the educational efforts that have been made to increase early detection of cervical cancer. Almost half of the women that are diagnosed with this life-threatening disease are between the ages of 35 and 55. They actually fall into two populations. In one population, the disease is relatively slow to evolve. Obviously, in this group, the detection of precancerous and pre-invasive changes allows for treatment of this disease to be relatively straightforward. But there is a second population, fortunately a much smaller population, where the disease behaves with sometimes frightening speed. The disease can be so aggressive as to go from a normal test to an actual invasive cancer within a year's time, and it is this group of individuals where these tests may, in fact, be lifesaving.

That is why it is so important that we highlight the awareness of cervical health. The month of January is more than half over. But the need for cervical cancer awareness and education should continue throughout the entire year.

Awareness is the leading cause in the annual decline in deaths from cervical disease. The survival rate of individuals who have cervical cancer is 96 to 99 percent when detected in the early stages versus only a 15 to 20 percent survival rate when cervical cancer is diagnosed after it has spread beyond the confines of the cervix. It is because of successful programs that encourage early diagnosis, such as national Cervical Health Awareness Month, that Americans can lead full and active lives.

By supporting the observance of national Cervical Health Awareness Month, we have the opportunity to encourage women to educate themselves about this disease and about the screening methods that are available to them.

Madam Speaker, I urge all Members to support this resolution.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1500

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to

the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. HALVORSON), who is the sponsor of the legislation.

Mrs. HALVORSON. I want to thank Congressman PALLONE. I would also like to thank my colleagues for recognizing me on behalf of this very important and timely resolution.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1011, commemorating the goals and ideals of Cervical Health Awareness Month, and I urge my colleagues to support its passage. January has long been recognized as Cervical Health Awareness Month, particularly throughout the public health, women's health, and cervical health advocacy communities.

Today we commemorate the hard work and sacrifice that has been made by these patients, their families, and those who have been confronted by this disease. We also honor the health care providers and advocates that tirelessly work to treat this disease and work to educate the general public on its causes and treatments.

Madam Speaker, cervical cancer is usually a very slow-growing cancer that may not present any symptoms. And it is primarily caused by the human papillomavirus, HPV, but can be detected by early detection tests. It is estimated that 4,000 women in the United States die of cervical cancer every year, and approximately 11,000 new cases will be detected just this year. Half of those women diagnosed with the disease are, as has been said, between 35 and 55 years of age. And approximately 20 percent of all those diagnoses are made in women who are older than 55 years of age. In the vast majority of cases, these deaths could be prevented with early detection, and by being educated and aware of causes, screenings, and medical treatments.

According to data from the Centers for Disease Control, cervical cancer is the easiest female cancer to prevent, and yet it was the number one cause of death from cancer in women. But for the first time in history, we have the potential for significantly reducing, if not eliminating, the number of victims of this cancer through advancements in treatments and procedures that aid in prevention.

So in keeping with the goals and the ideals of Cervical Health Awareness Month, I encourage the people of the United States to learn about cervical cancer, its causes and its treatments, and I encourage health care advocates to continue to raise public awareness about cervical cancer and the importance of early detection, because the earlier cervical cancer is detected, the better the chance a woman has in surviving cervical cancer.

Once again, I would like to thank you all for allowing H. Res. 1011 to come to the floor today, and I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of its passage.

Mr. BURGESS. As a fellow in the American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists before I came to Con-

gress, I recognize the importance of Cervical Health Awareness Month. And yes, while we are focusing on testing today, the gentlelady is quite correct in that newer tests, newer methods, newer abilities to prevent this disease from happening are occurring even as we speak.

Certainly to the health care community out there that has done such a great job at providing information to their patients, providing early detection and treatment to their patients, we owe a debt of gratitude. The work is not yet done, and I again encourage passage of this legislation.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H. Res. 1011, to recognize the importance of cervical health and of detecting cervical cancer during its earliest stages and supporting the goals and ideals of Cervical Health Awareness Month, introduced by my distinguish colleague Representative DEBORAH L. HALVORSON, from Illinois. This legislation will solidify that we, the United States Congress: (1) support all the initiatives of Cervical Health Awareness Month; (2) Recognize the importance of earlier detection; and (3) advocate and encourage education on the subject.

Madam Speaker, the origin of Cervical Health Awareness Month was established to enhance awareness of the prevention of cervical cancer, particularly the importance of screening for this malignancy. It is my hope that Congress continues to support these current and future efforts to make our constituents more knowledgeable.

According to the American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists, in 2009, an estimated 11,270 new cases of cervical cancer were diagnosed in the U.S., and the disease caused over 4,000 deaths. The Pap test is a highly effective tool in detecting cervical cancer at its earliest and most treatable stages. In fact, regular cervical screening tests can actually find precancerous changes before they become dangerous and turn into cancer.

I support any enterprise which cultivates organized successful health promotion events and campaigns. Getting new ideas, information and resources on Cervical Cancer and the prevention of it, is something that this Congress must emphasize.

By passing this resolution, we are making a monumental statement that we care. We care about the patients and survivors of this cancer; we care about the families of the ones who were taken by this disease; and most of all we care about the life and life more abundantly. By passing this legislation, we are also reaffirming that Congress is not an ambiguous body of unsympathetic individuals with no grasp of the world outside these walls. We have families; we have mothers, daughters and sisters, that can be affected by this cancer and we will not stand for lives perishing because of a lack of knowledge and available prevention and treatment!

Mr. BURGESS. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) that the House suspend the

rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1011.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

NATIONAL INFLUENZA VACCINATION WEEK

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 1003) expressing support for the designation of January 10, 2010, through January 16, 2010, as National Influenza Vaccination Week, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 1003

Whereas National Influenza Vaccination Week may provide an important opportunity to encourage seasonal flu and H1N1 vaccination at a time when demand for flu vaccines usually drops significantly but the risk for infection remains;

Whereas each year 5 to 20 percent of the population in the United States gets the flu, an average of more than 200,000 people are hospitalized from flu-related complications, and about 36,000 people die from flu-related causes;

Whereas between April and mid-November, the United States saw approximately 47,000,000 cases of the 2009 H1N1 flu, more than 200,000 hospitalizations, and nearly 10,000 deaths;

Whereas the United States is fortunate that the flu activity has declined in recent weeks, but flu experts warn that the public is still at risk of infection and we should also prepare for a possible third wave of H1N1 flu;

Whereas people in the United States have a window of opportunity to get the H1N1 vaccine and lessen the impact of, or even prevent, another wave of illness;

Whereas getting vaccinated is a shared responsibility to protect families and communities that is safe and effective, and it is the best defense against all types of flu;

Whereas seasonal flu vaccines have been safely used for more than 60 years and data compiled for H1N1 vaccines indicate a similarly excellent safety profile;

Whereas information on seasonal flu vaccine distribution and availability is available at the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention's (CDC) www.Flu.gov Web site;

Whereas over 135,000,000 doses of the H1N1 vaccine are now available, with more coming every day;

Whereas Congress recognizes the hard work of public health officials in responding to the 2009 H1N1 flu;

Whereas one of the goals, in addition to fostering continuing influenza vaccination, of National Influenza Vaccination Week is to engage H1N1 at-risk audiences who are not yet vaccinated;

Whereas when the vaccine was first made available, the CDC's Advisory Committee on Immunization Practices (ACIP) recommended that vaccination efforts should

focus first on people in five target groups who are at higher risk for the 2009 H1N1 influenza or related complications;

Whereas the five target groups for H1N1 are pregnant women, people who live with or provide care for infants younger than 6 months, health care and emergency medical services personnel, people 6 months through 24 years of age, and people 25 years through 64 years of age who have certain medical conditions that put them at higher risk for influenza-related complications;

Whereas Monica Rodriguez, a pregnant mother from El Monte, California, could likely have prevented her death if she was able to get vaccinated;

Whereas January 13 is Families Flu Vaccination Day and will highlight the importance of the 2009 H1N1 vaccination for pregnant women, children, and caregivers of children less than 6 months of age;

Whereas H1N1 flu shots are widely available and everyone, even those not in the high-risk groups are urged to get vaccinated;

Whereas the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services as well as State and local public health departments and other partners, such as Families Fighting Flu, are planning National Influenza Vaccination Week events around the country and have additional information available at www.cdc.gov/flu/NIVW/;

Whereas the American Public Health Association, the Association of State and Territorial Health Officials, Families Fighting Flu, the Infectious Diseases Society of America, the American Medical Association, the American Nurses Association, the American Academy of Pediatrics, the American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists, the National Environmental Health Association, the National Association of Nurse Practitioners in Women's Health, the American Association of Colleges of Nursing, the Society for Healthcare Epidemiology of America, the American Osteopathic Association, the National Association of Community Health Centers, the National Association of Pediatric Nurse Practitioners, the American Red Cross, the American Academy of Physician Assistants, the National Hispanic Medical Association, the American College of Emergency Physicians, the American College of Preventive Medicine, the National Alliance for Hispanic Health, the International Association of Firefighters, the American Academy of Family Physicians, the Association for Profession in Infection Control and Epidemiology, the American Pharmacists Association, the American College Health Association, the American College of Physicians, the National Family Planning and Reproductive Health Association, the National Association of School Nurses, the Association of Maternal and Child Health Programs, the National Association of Children's Hospitals and Related Institutions, the National Community Pharmacists Association, the American Hospital Association, the Federation of American Hospitals, Epocrates, the American Academy of Neurology, the National Association of County and City Health Officials, and the Association of Occupational Health Professionals in Healthcare support the H1N1 flu vaccine; and

Whereas people can find seasonal and H1N1 vaccine distribution information by checking the www.Flu.gov Web site that identifies clinics that have influenza vaccine available: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) supports the designation of National Influenza Vaccination Week, including raising public awareness that vaccination is the best defense against the flu; and

(2) encourages people in the United States to get vaccinated, especially those with un-

derlying health conditions, pregnant women, children, young adults, caretakers of infants, and healthcare workers.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I yield to myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support of H. Res. 1003, expressing support for the designation of January 10 through January 16, 2010, as National Influenza Vaccination Week. In the 6 months between April and mid-November, there were approximately 47 million cases of the 2009 H1N1 flu in the United States. More than 200,000 individuals were hospitalized, and tragically, nearly 10,000 people lost their lives to this illness. One of those individuals was Monica Rodriguez, who died in October 2009, before the H1N1 vaccine was available.

Ms. Rodriguez, a constituent of Representative JUDY CHU's, was the mother of three children, and was 5 months pregnant at the time she died. As a pregnant woman, Monica was considered a high risk, and would have been on the priority list to get the vaccine as soon as it was ready. Vaccines save lives. And had the vaccine been available, it could have saved her life.

Though flu activity has declined in recent weeks, experts warn that the risk for contracting the flu is still great. We must prepare for a possible third wave of H1N1 flu, and Americans must remain vigilant about preventing infection of the H1N1 virus and the seasonal flu. In both instances, the vaccines can help protect against these illnesses.

Now the resolution before us today shows our support for National Influenza Vaccination Week, which is sponsored by the Centers for Disease Control. By supporting this resolution, Congress will help urge all Americans to take advantage of the supply of vaccine available to prevent further needless deaths from the H1N1 virus or seasonal flu.

I want to thank my colleague, Representative CHU, for her work on this important issue. I urge my colleagues to pass this resolution.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today in support of H. Res. 1003, supporting the designation of January

10 through January 16 as National Influenza Vaccination Week. I would like to thank the numerous associations and health professionals for their work in this regard. The National Influenza Vaccination Week is an important opportunity to encourage those vulnerable to seasonal flu and those vulnerable to H1N1 to avail themselves of a vaccination.

Although there has been a major decrease in the number of cases of H1N1, those who have not been vaccinated should consider how important it is to protect not only themselves, but the health of their family, their community, and of course their own well-being.

Currently, there are well over 130,000 doses of the H1N1 vaccine available, and we are told that there is more coming every day. For those wondering where they can get more information about the seasonal flu vaccines and the H1N1, they can visit the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention's www.flu.gov Web site.

Again, I want to thank all of the health professionals for their efforts to lower the impact of the illness this flu season. I stand in support of this legislation, and urge my colleagues to join me.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I would like to recognize now the sponsor of the legislation, the gentlewoman from California, Representative CHU, for as much time as she may consume.

Ms. CHU. Thank you, Chairman PALLONE and Chairman WAXMAN, for your assistance in getting this resolution presented to the House floor.

It is January 26, and several months of flu season are still before us. Many people are still at risk of contracting H1N1 but have not gotten the vaccination that would save their lives. Months before cold and flu season began, the media and health professionals warned us about the potential complications from this new strain of flu, H1N1. And indeed, this virus killed over 10,000 people last year.

The purpose of this resolution is to remind people that the threat is not over, and that it is imperative that they get their H1N1 vaccination. Such a vaccination would have helped one of my constituents, Monica Rodriguez. Monica was a wife, mother of three children, and 5 months pregnant. After experiencing severe flu symptoms, including fever, congestion, and cough, Monica went twice in 24 hours to a hospital in El Monte, but she was turned away with only cough syrup to numb the pain, which did little to help the underlying illness.

Days later, after only getting worse, Monica returned to the hospital, where she was immediately admitted into intensive care, but it was too late. On October 25, 2009, Monica and her unborn child passed away from complications of the H1N1 virus. Monica's husband, Jorge Gonzalez, wants others to know his wife's story so that they can receive proper care. Many may believe

that the risk of death from H1N1 no longer exists, but flu experts warn that we should prepare for a possible third wave of H1N1.

Americans definitely have a window of opportunity of getting this vaccine and lessening the impact, or even preventing, another wave of illness. And Monica's husband Jorge would tell you that he wished a vaccine was available to save his wife's life.

The threat of H1N1 is clearly not over. Getting vaccinated is the most important step to preventing the spread of influenza. That is why I have authored this resolution, which recognizes National Influenza Vaccination Week. In contrast to last year, the H1N1 vaccine is now widely available. The risk of contracting flu is still high, and we have several months of flu season before us. Today with this resolution we have another opportunity to get the word out and to remind the public that it is the time to protect yourself.

Many public health departments, hospitals, doctors and nurses are doing a good job of preventing and treating the 22 million cases of H1N1 across the country. However, we must not be complacent and let patients like Monica slip through the cracks. In fact, we must remind everyone to get the H1N1 vaccine.

Today you can easily find the shot, such as online at flu.gov. And of course, we must not forget those who are still at greatest risk, pregnant women like Monica, people who care for infants, health care and emergency medical services personnel, those under the age of 24, and people with medical conditions that put them at higher risk for influenza-related complications.

Please join me and the 22 health organizations that have endorsed this resolution in showing support for National Influenza Vaccination Week and spreading the message that getting vaccinated is the first step towards preventing the flu. Its passage will not only avert another wave of H1N1 but will honor Monica Rodriguez and all those who have suffered or died from the virus.

List of Healthcare Organizations that Support H. Res. 1003: American Academy of Neurology, American Academy of Pediatrics, American Academy of Physician Assistants, American Association of Colleges of Nursing, American College Health Association, American College of Preventative Medicine, American Nurses Association, American Pharmacists Association, American Public Health Association, American Society of Health-System Pharmacists, Association for Professionals in Infection Control and Epidemiology, Inc., Association of State and Territorial Health Officials, Families Fighting Flu, National Association of Children's Hospitals and Related Institutions, National Association of County and City Health Officials, National Association of Nurse Practitioners in Women's Health, National Community Pharmacists Association, National Environmental Health Association, National Family Planning and Reproductive Health Association, National Foundation for Infectious Diseases, The Society for Healthcare Epidemiology of America, Trust for America's Health.

Mr. BURGESS. You know, it is just about 10 months ago that we first began to hear about this novel strain of flu that was coming across the border from Mexico. My home State of Texas was affected severely early on. And it is amazing that within such a short period of time the virus was identified, isolated, the genetic sequence was known, and then a vaccination was developed, tested, found to be safe, and delivered into the hands of Americans shortly after the commencement of the school year this year.

We did lose many individuals to this illness, and for that we are sorry. But I would also stress that because of the efforts of the men and women who worked at the CDC, the National Institutes of Health, all the practitioners across this country who provided information and timely vaccination, the effect of this epidemic was significantly blunted over what it might have been. Those early telephone calls, those early conference calls in March and April of last year were nothing short of startling and alarming.

□ 1515

I do urge people to avail themselves of this vaccine before this flu season is over.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of House Resolution 1003; a resolution entitled "Expressing support for the designation of January 10, 2010, through January 16, 2010, as National Influenza Vaccination Week," and which also expresses the sentiments of the House of Representatives that preventing the spread of influenza and other infectious diseases should be a priority of all American citizens.

It is important that we recognize the important role that immunizations have in protecting Americans from influenza outbreaks. Seasonal influenza causes more than 200,000 hospitalizations and 36,000 deaths in the U.S. every year, and is the seventh leading cause of death in the U.S.

It is important that we mitigate this great threat to our citizens and equip all Americans with the necessary preventative measures to effectively combat both the seasonal flu as well as the H1N1 Influenza strain.

The flu can be very disruptive to business and trade as well. The economic and financial costs of seasonal influenza in the United States can be devastating due to employee absence from work, the high cost associated with medical care and the draw down in the financial activity of persons infected with the flu. In addition, lost earnings due to illness and loss of life amounted to over \$15 billion annually and the total economic burden of annual influenza epidemics amounts to over \$80 billion.

Again, it is important for us to alleviate this growing stress on our nation's economic and financial systems by equipping our citizens with the necessary tools to fight the flu.

Furthermore, both the seasonal flu and the H1N1 Influenza strain can be disruptive to important American pastimes such as cultural events as well as sporting events. In the event of a highly contagious infectious outbreak it would be likely that large gatherings of people could be cancelled in order to prevent the unnecessary spread of disease.

By informing American citizens of the benefits of influenza vaccines however, we can attempt to prohibit the influenza bug from spreading.

In addition it is important that American citizens remain vigilant in the fight against the H1N1 Influenza strain. There are currently over 135 million doses of the H1N1 vaccine available to Americans. It is important that citizens weigh the costs and benefits of such a shot before receiving it, but it is important for citizens to remain informed. For the very young and the elderly it can be very helpful in preventing disease but may also prevent unnecessary death.

That is why it is important for Americans to understand both the necessity and benefit that seasonal flu shots provide for its citizens.

This is also the reason I ask for your support of this resolution. The increased awareness that would come from designating the week of January 10, 2010 through January 16, 2010 as "National Influenza Vaccination Week" would serve to provide American citizens with the important information needed to prevent a larger-than-normal influenza outbreak as well as provide the necessary preventative measures to those who are at a higher risk for influenza-related complications.

I would also like to take this opportunity to encourage all Americans as well as those from my home town of Houston, Texas to get vaccinated against both the seasonal flu as well as the H1N1 Influenza strain. I would especially encourage people with underlying health conditions, pregnant women, children, young adults, caretakers of infants, and healthcare workers to get vaccinated in preparation for a possible third wave of H1N1 flu.

Officially establishing the week of January 10, 2010, through January 16, 2010 as "National Influenza Vaccination Week," would seek to improve the lives of our citizens as well as increase our citizen's awareness of the importance of both seasonal as well as H1N1 Influenza vaccinations.

I urge my colleagues to support this resolution. I also ask my colleagues for their continued support in the fight against infectious and contagious diseases.

Mr. PAUL. Madam Speaker, I oppose H. Res. 1003, designating January 10, 2010 through January 16, 2010 as National Influenza Vaccination Week. While I believe the American people should be made aware of infectious diseases and common sense preventative measures, I am concerned that this resolution continues the hysterical reaction from government officials to the swine flu outbreak.

As a physician, I have yet to see any evidence that justifies the current level of alarm. Influenza typically kills around 36,000 people every year in this country and hospitalizes a couple hundred thousand. In the almost a year since swine flu made its first appearance in the U.S., there have been only a handful of confirmed deaths attributable to this strain, and most of those sickened have or will fully recover. Every death is tragic, but I see no reason to deal with this flu outbreak any differently than we typically deal with any other flu season. Instead, the federal government has responded with invasive screening at airports, closing down schools and sporting events, and causing general panic.

There have also been discussions of mandating that certain populations be forced to receive the swine flu vaccine. I would remind my

colleagues that during the 1976 outbreak of swine flu only 1 America died from the flu, but mandatory vaccinations killed at least 25 before the program was abandoned.

Madam Speaker, the panicked reaction to swine flu outbreak demonstrates why the Federal Government should not become involved in health care. Instead, decisions as to how best to deal with infectious disease should be left to local communities, health care providers, and, most importantly of all, individual citizens. Patients should always have the right to make their own decision about whether or not to receive a vaccine after getting full information on both the risks and the benefits of vaccines from their health care provider.

Mr. BURGESS. I have no other speakers on my side, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I have no additional speakers. I urge passage of this resolution, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1003, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

EMERGENCY AID TO AMERICAN SURVIVORS OF THE HAITI EARTHQUAKE ACT

Mr. McDERMOTT. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 2949) to amend section 1113 of the Social Security Act to provide authority for increased fiscal year 2010 payments for temporary assistance to United States citizens returned from foreign countries, to provide necessary funding to avoid shortfalls in the Medicare cost-sharing program for low-income qualifying individuals, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 2949

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Emergency Aid to American Survivors of the Haiti Earthquake Act".

SEC. 2. INCREASE IN AGGREGATE PAYMENTS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2010 FOR TEMPORARY ASSISTANCE TO UNITED STATES CITIZENS RETURNED FROM FOREIGN COUNTRIES.

Section 1113(d) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1313(d)) is amended by striking "September, 30, 2003" and all that follows and inserting "September 30, 2009, except that, in the case of fiscal year 2010, the total amount of such assistance provided during that fiscal year shall not exceed \$25,000,000."

SEC. 3. QI PROGRAM FUNDING.

Section 1933(g)(2) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396u-3(g)(2)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (M), by striking "\$412,500,000" and inserting "\$462,500,000"; and

(2) in subparagraph (N), by striking "\$150,000,000" and inserting "\$165,000,000".

SEC. 4. APPLICATION OF MEDICAID IMPROVEMENT FUND.

Section 1941(b)(1)(A) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396w-1(b)(1)(A)) is amended by striking "\$100,000,000" and inserting "\$10,000,000".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. McDERMOTT) and the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) be allowed to control 10 minutes of the time for debate on this bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. McDERMOTT. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on S. 2949.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Madam Speaker, 2 weeks ago, the largest earthquake ever recorded in Haiti wreaked havoc throughout the country.

Some of those affected by the devastation in Haiti are U.S. citizens who are now being evacuated back to the United States. We need to act today to continue a program that helps these Americans get back home.

The Repatriation Program provides assistance to U.S. citizens evacuating foreign countries due to a crisis by helping them secure and pay for connecting flights, temporary lodging, food, and medical assistance. Recipients of this assistance are expected to reimburse the government for such aid, unless repayment poses a significant hardship.

This program has an annual funding cap of only \$1 million, which is far short of the funding needed to help all the U.S. citizens returning home. There were roughly 45,000 Americans living in Haiti when the earthquake hit, and over 14,000 have already been evacuated.

The bill before us increases the program's funding cap to \$25 million for this year so that it can continue to serve U.S. citizens returning from Haiti.

It is worth noting that we have raised this program's annual funding cap in response to past international crises. Most recently, in 2006, Congress

responded to a request from the Bush administration to increase the program's funding to help Americans evacuating Lebanon.

As sent over by the Senate, this bill also continues funding for another group of needy Americans, low-income senior citizens. A program known as QI that now helps Medicare beneficiaries with their part B premiums if their income is only slightly above the poverty line requires additional funding in order to continue to provide assistance to every State throughout the rest of the year. This legislation provides the necessary funding to address this shortfall and to ensure the program continues to operate.

The Congressional Budget Office reports that the cost of both of these provisions is fully offset by a reduction in the Medicaid Improvement Fund, which provides additional funding to HHS for program management.

In short, this bill helps people in great need of assistance without raising the deficit.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this effort to help Americans evacuating from Haiti and to continue assistance to Medicare beneficiaries.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support of this Senate bill, S. 2949. As Representative McDERMOTT described, it will provide assistance to thousands of Americans returning from Haiti following the devastating January 12 earthquake there.

Let me reiterate that we are helping American citizens with this legislation.

The bill, entitled Emergency Aid to American Survivors of the Haiti Earthquake Act, will ensure that State and local governments and charitable agencies on the ground in Florida, for example, and elsewhere have the resources to do exactly that.

Funding for those local efforts is provided through the Repatriation Program administered by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. Each year, that program provides temporary assistance in the form of loans to U.S. citizens and their dependents arriving in the U.S. following an emergency. By law, currently the program is capped at \$1 million per year.

This bill, which passed the Senate last night, temporarily increases that cap for 2010. As the legislation makes clear, and the Congressional Budget Office score confirms, this increase is entirely paid for by reducing spending in other areas. It does not raise the national debt.

This is similar to how Congress responded when demand for repatriation assistance swelled following the American evacuation of Lebanon in 2006. Congress stepped in to provide for the additional funds that were needed and paid for that additional funding through savings. That is the right approach. And, frankly, my constituents

would like to see this balanced budget approach applied across the board, not just to the smallest items.

For my part, I wish we were cutting funds in the bloated State Department budget to pay for this emergency. As I am sure my colleagues would agree, Congress should be looking for ways to save taxpayer dollars all the time, not just when new spending emergency needs come up. Unfortunately, since we are acting on a Senate bill, these concerns will have to wait for another day.

Before I yield, I would like to note the special importance this bill has for the State of Florida. Since so many of our returning citizens are arriving through my home State, I truly appreciate my colleagues supporting this bill and making sure that State and local agencies have the resources that they need to respond to this emergency.

The State Department suggests that there were approximately 45,000 U.S. citizens in Haiti and that they were there when the earthquake hit. As of yesterday, some 14,000 had already returned to the United States. I commend all the workers in Florida and across the country, whether with State or local government agencies, the Red Cross, our Armed Forces, or other agencies who are helping fellow citizens as they travel to their final destinations in the United States.

The House and Senate are to be commended for acting very quickly on this legislation. Passing the Emergency Aid to American Survivors of the Haiti Earthquake Act today is important to thousands of Americans who have been displaced and who need a helping hand to return home. I encourage support for this bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in strong support of the Emergency Aid to American Survivors of the Haiti Earthquake Act, or S. 2949, which passed the Senate last night with bipartisan support.

As my colleagues on the Ways and Means Committee have explained, this bill provides \$25 million to enable the Secretary of HHS to reimburse States for the costs of providing temporary assistance to U.S. citizens who have returned from the catastrophe in Haiti without available resources.

I want to focus on the portion of the bill that provides temporary assistance for low-income Medicare beneficiaries under what is known as the Medicaid QI program.

Currently, Medicaid pays the Medicare part B premiums for low-income Medicare beneficiaries with incomes between 120 percent and 135 percent of the Federal poverty level. That translates to an income of between \$13,000 and \$14,600 per year.

Now, the monthly part B premium is \$96.40 per month, or \$1,157 per year. And this is 8 percent to 9 percent of the income of these low-income, elderly,

and disabled Medicare beneficiaries. Obviously, having Medicaid pay this premium makes Medicare much more affordable for these people and eases their financial struggles.

This Medicaid payment comes from a fixed amount of funding for the QIs that is allocated among the States. According to the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, that fund is about \$65 million short for this calendar year 2010. When the fund runs out, States have the option of continuing to pay the part B premiums for this population with their own funds or simply stopping new enrollment.

One State, Arizona, has already announced that it is capping its QI program this week in response to an estimated \$2.8 million shortfall in its allotment. The State is going to give public notice and then deny all new Arizona applications. This will affect approximately 175 Medicare beneficiaries in Arizona each month.

While no other State has yet to stop enrollment, there are 21 States in addition to Arizona that have projected shortfalls in their QI funding. That includes Alabama, Arkansas, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Mississippi, Nevada, New York, North Carolina, Oklahoma, Oregon, Rhode Island, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, and Vermont.

By filling this \$65 million national QI funding shortfall for this calendar year, this bill will allow Arizona to uncap its QI program and help the other 21 States avoid capping theirs. Tens of thousands of low-income Medicare beneficiaries all over the country will be able to receive assistance with their part B premiums.

Madam Speaker, let me stress that this bill is fully paid for. It withdraws \$90 million from the Medicaid Improvement Fund to offset both the cost of the temporary assistance for U.S. citizens returning from Haiti and the cost of funding the QI program shortfall. In fact, CBO estimates that the legislation will actually reduce the deficit by \$14 million. So I think overall this is very good legislation, very helpful to the States, and certainly significant for those who are returning from Haiti. And I would urge my colleagues to suspend the rules and pass S. 2949.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida. This legislation will ensure that American citizens returning from the devastation in Haiti in the days ahead will receive the same help and support as those who have already arrived and gotten their way home. It also will ensure that the many individuals hard at work assisting their fellow citizens will get the resources they need to continue these important efforts. I would ask my colleagues to join me in supporting this bill.

Mr. McDERMOTT. I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL).

Mr. RANGEL. I want to thank my colleagues, and especially Dr.

McDERMOTT, for bringing this piece of legislation to the floor to give some assistance to American citizens who found themselves in Haiti during this tragedy. This comes under the Social Security system, and I'm glad that Dr. McDERMOTT was able to bring it to the floor.

I have never been more proud of the Congress, my country, and, indeed, citizens throughout the world for rallying to the cause of these young people.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of S. 2949: The "Emergency Aid to American Survivors of the Haiti Earthquake Act." This bill would provide up to \$25 million in Fiscal Year 2010 for a Department of Health and Human Services program which repatriates U.S. citizens from foreign countries. This assistance is vital to Americans who were living in Haiti when the earthquake struck as well as the families of those displaced who are now faced with the unexpected responsibility of supporting their repatriating relatives.

This repatriation assistance provides temporary assistance to citizens and their dependents who are identified by the Department of State as needing to return from a foreign country to the U.S. but who do not have the resources to do so.

As you know, on Tuesday, January 12th, a massive, 7.0 magnitude earthquake struck Haiti near the capital of Port-au-Prince. There is still no official estimate of death or destruction but the damage to buildings is extensive and the number of injured or dead is estimated to be in the hundreds of thousands.

The full dimensions of the disaster are still unfolding, but Haiti's Prime Minister Jean-Max Bellerive told CNN that he believes there are well over 100,000 dead, and leading senator Youri Latortue estimated the number at possibly as high as 500,000, according the Associated Press.

America is responding, and will continue to respond with immediate humanitarian assistance to help the people of this struggling island nation rebuild their livelihoods. I send my condolences to the people and government of Haiti as they grieve once again in the aftermath of a natural disaster. As Haiti's neighbor, I believe it is the United States' responsibility to help Haiti recover, and build the capacity to mitigate against future disasters.

America and her allies have already initiated a comprehensive, interagency response to the earthquake. The State Department, Department of Defense, Department of Homeland Security, Coast Guard, USAID—all worked overnight to ensure critical resources were positioned to support the response and recovery effort, including efforts to find and assist American citizens in Haiti.

Within days of last week's devastating earthquake, U.S. Southern Command deployed a team of 30 people to Haiti to support U.S. relief efforts in the aftermath of one of the largest natural disasters in the western hemisphere. The team included U.S. military engineers, operational planners, and a command and control group and communication specialists arriving on two C-130 Hercules aircraft. Since, there has been a tremendous interagency response with support and partnering with U.S. Embassy personnel as well as Haitian, United Nations and international officials

to assess the situation and facilitate follow-on U.S. military support.

Our friends in the international community must also be commended for their efforts. The United Nations is releasing \$10 million from its emergency funds. The European Commission has approved €3 million (\$4.37 million) with more funds likely. Countless other nations, from Germany to China to Israel to Mexico have also pledged support. I commend each of these nations for coming to our neighboring nation in dire need of assistance.

Many of my constituents have asked what they can do to help, or how they can find their loved ones. Those who are interested in helping immediately can text 'HAITI' to '90999' and a donation of \$10 will be made automatically to the Red Cross for relief efforts. The donation will be charged to your cell phone bill.

The outpouring of support and funding from the American people was both instant and sustained. According to the Washington Post, the text messaging effort raised \$5 million in its first day, breaking the previous one-day record of about \$450,000. Text-message donations continue to play a larger-than-expected role in the push for earthquake relief in Haiti. As of late Sunday, the American Red Cross said that it had collected pledges of about \$103 million, including \$22 million through the text donation program. Each donor should be proud of their contribution to help their brothers and sisters in Haiti.

Financially, 2009 was not an easy year for many Americans. Although thousands of jobs were created and we are back on the road to economic recovery, Americans lived on tighter budgets than usual. This legislation passed today will allow those Americans who have generously donated money to Haiti to receive their tax break this year instead of next year.

In January of 2005, Congress enacted this type of relief for individuals that made charitable contributions to victims of the Indian Ocean tsunami that occurred in late December of 2004. That bill (H.R. 241 in the 109th Congress) passed the House of Representatives without objection and subsequently passed the Senate by unanimous consent. I hope that this legislation, like our response to the 2004 tsunami, will encourage Americans to contribute more money to Haiti. As Haiti starts on its long recovery, every dollar is critically important. Americans have responded in great numbers, and I am proud to represent such a compassionate and generous nation.

Americans are not only giving their money, they are also giving their time and expertise as well. This weekend, I arranged for a team of seven doctors, six nurses, two techs, and two search and rescue volunteers to fly to Haiti and provide immediate humanitarian support. This team led by Dr. Richard Toussaint from Forest Park Medical Center in Dallas Texas arrived in Haiti just after noon on Saturday. From there, the doctors made their way to Hospital Sacre-Coeur where, in roughly two days, they performed about 70 amputations, surgically treated about 150 patients, and saw about 600 patients total. I commend this team of medical personnel for their selfless actions and willingness to spend their own time and money to come to the aid of people they had never met.

Additionally, I hosted a Houston-based Haiti relief effort called "Texans helping Haitians" with city leadership and the Haitian community in the aftermath of this horrible disaster.

Groups included in the effort to provide supplies and medical assistance to Haiti were: Texas Medical Center, Texas Dental Association, Search and Rescue Organizations, the Haitian Multicultural Association, Haitian Caribbean Organization of Texas, Caribbean Impact Foundation, and Haiti Counts.

We also helped coordinate the safe return of six Houston Rotarians that were stranded in the mountains and we are now working with Office of Foreign Disaster Assistance on the transport of orphans to awaiting families here in the U.S. Our paramount duty is to protect Americans, and this bill will do exactly that.

In addition to providing temporary assistance directly to repatriates, the program also provides funds to States and other vendors to cover the administrative costs of providing temporary assistance to these individuals. This financial assistance is repayable to the U.S. government, unless waived by the Secretary of Health and Human Services.

Additionally, this legislation provides an additional \$60 million in funding for the Qualifying Individual (QI) program, which allows States to fund the Medicare Part B premiums of near-poor seniors not eligible for Medicaid.

The bill's Haiti funding and the increased QI funds are paid for through transfers from the Medicaid Improvement Fund. The Medicaid Improvement Fund is a program intended to improve the management of the Medicaid program. The legislation cuts \$90 million from that fund.

Medicare is a lifeline for Houston's seniors and this bill takes crucial steps toward strengthening it and providing the highest quality of care and benefits for our elderly.

In my home state of Texas, the need for a more efficient healthcare is more prevalent now than ever. One in four Texans, about 5.7 million people, or 24.5 percent of the state's population, has no health insurance coverage. An estimated 1,339,550 Texas children—20.2 percent of Texas children—are uninsured. According to the U.S. Census Bureau, Texas has the nation's highest percentage of uninsured residents. This poses consequences for every person, business and local government in the state who bear extra costs to pay for uncompensated care. If Medicare funding is allowed to be cut or capped, the number of uninsured will grow dramatically.

Once again, I am devastated by the immeasurable tragedy that occurred in Haiti. Along with my colleagues, I hope to visit Haiti in the near future to meet with their leaders and see what the United States can do to rebuild the shattered livelihoods. This bill will help two categories of Americans with no cost to the taxpayers. I strongly support this bill and urge my colleagues to join me in voting in favor of it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Madam Speaker, it is difficult to comprehend the depth of tragedy and sorrow that has visited the poor island of Haiti. It is difficult to convey the depth of our sympathy and shock at the catastrophe that has befallen the Haitian people.

Madam Speaker, the extent of the misery, destruction and death is nearly beyond imagination. It surely puts our own national trials and tribulations into perspective.

Our national unity in pursuing efforts to relieve the suffering of the Haitian people has been tremendously encouraging, particularly as this unity has sprung up amid the division and vitriol that have plagued our national politics in recent months and years.

And while our efforts to bring aid to the Haitians must continue, and will continue, our first priority, our first obligation, our first solemn duty as Americans and members of the United States Congress is to rescue and provide immediate relief to the American citizens in Haiti who are victims of this tragic natural disaster.

I applaud Chairman RANGEL in the House and Chairman BAUCUS in the Senate for their swift and focused action. On short notice and in an environment of uncertainty they have crafted a bill that will ensure the U.S. government has the resources and authority it needs to provide emergency aid to American survivors of this earthquake.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of S. 2949.

Two weeks ago today, Haiti was devastated by its largest earthquake in over two centuries.

The United States has been unparalleled in its efforts to assist Haiti in the wake of this catastrophe and it only makes sense that we would show the same compassion and generosity to the many Americans who were victims of this tragic disaster.

As my colleagues have shared, this bill will provide important temporary assistance to help U.S. citizens on a need basis as they return from Haiti and re-establish themselves here in the U.S.

When the earthquake struck, there were an estimated 45,000 Americans living in Haiti.

Since then, nearly 12,000 Americans have been evacuated.

This bill will help to cover the costs related to these repatriations.

Again, I rise in support of this important measure and if I may, would also like to take a moment to acknowledge the many Americans whose lives were lost as well in the earthquake.

My most sincere thoughts and prayers go out to all of the family and friends who lost loved ones that day.

Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I have no additional speakers. I urge passage of the legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. McDERMOTT. I urge the passage of S. 2949, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. McDERMOTT) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 2949.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1530

POVERTY IN AMERICA AWARENESS MONTH

Mr. McDERMOTT. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 1024) expressing

support for designation of January as Poverty in America Awareness Month.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 1024

Whereas, in 2008, the Census Bureau found that the number of people living in poverty has jumped by nearly 2,600,000 to 39,800,000, the highest number since 1960;

Whereas that same report found that the percentage of people living in poverty, 13.2 percent, rose to the highest level since 1997;

Whereas, in 2008, the number of children who lived in poverty increased by 744,000 to 14,000,000;

Whereas the share of people in the United States who have incomes that fall below half of the Federal poverty line reached 5.7 percent, or 17,100,000 people, its highest level since 1994;

Whereas the next Census report on poverty will likely illustrate higher levels of poverty as the report will reflect data from 2009, a year in which the economy experienced substantial job loss and historic levels of long-term unemployment, leading some experts to project that the overall poverty rate may increase by 1.5 percentage points and the percentage of children living in poverty may increase by 6 percentage points in the next report;

Whereas, between 1989 and 2000, the overall poverty rate declined by 1.5 percentage points and child poverty decreased by 3.4 percentage points, those achievements have been nearly reversed as the overall poverty rate increased by 1.9 percentage points and child poverty increased by 2.8 percentage points from 2000 to 2008;

Whereas there is broad consensus among researchers and policy experts that the Federal poverty measure is outdated and inadequate in determining the depth and extent of poverty in the United States;

Whereas rising levels of poverty and economic hardship have a severe impact on the overall well-being of children in the Nation;

Whereas the U.S. Census Bureau and other organizations have highlighted the unmet needs that existed for some of the most vulnerable families prior to the recession;

Whereas while the Federal Government has provided critical assistance to needy individuals and families in their time of need, more can and should be done to strengthen the Nation's safety-net programs, and other programs investing in communities and families to ensure that all needy people in the United States have access to the support services for which they are eligible;

Whereas, during the present economic downturn, Congress should do more to help individuals and families rise out of poverty and maintain economic stability through the use of a variety of programs promoting education and training, childcare assistance, housing security, and related services; and

Whereas it would be appropriate to designate the month of January 2010 as Poverty in America Awareness Month: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That—

(1) the House of Representatives—

(A) supports the designation of Poverty in America Awareness Month; and

(B) recognizes the important contributions of those individuals and organizations that have made a commitment to providing critical support and services to needy individuals and families; and

(2) it is the sense of the House of Representatives that—

(A) eradicating poverty in the United States should be the goal for all people in

the United States, including all levels of government;

(B) the severe economic downturn has highlighted the need to ensure that the Nation's most vulnerable individuals and families are able to meet their most fundamental needs during a time of financial crisis; and

(C) Congress should recommit itself to helping individuals and families facing economic hardship receive the assistance they need and deserve in moving towards greater economic security through programs under Title IV of the Social Security Act and other related programs.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. McDERMOTT) and the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. McDERMOTT. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H. Res. 1024.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today in support of recognizing the designation of January as "Poverty in America Awareness Month."

In 2008, there were nearly 40 million Americans living in poverty, including one in every five children. There were also more than 49 million Americans living in households that the USDA calls "food insecure," which is really just a technical way to say that those 49 million Americans—nearly one out of every four children—had experienced hunger. While poverty affects every segment of our population, these figures are drastically higher for children in single-parent families and in black and Latino households.

At the same time, a recent report showed that the top 1 percent of the richest Americans now hold the greatest proportion of our Nation's wealth since 1928. For the wealthiest Nation in the world, this is completely unacceptable, and we must readjust our priorities. In fact, the way we measure poverty is badly outdated.

The current poverty threshold is calculated by taking the cost of a minimal diet in 1955 and multiplying that number by 3 and then adjusting this amount for inflation. That method may have made some sense when the measure was created in the 1960s because the cost of food actually made up about one-third of a family's average expenditure, but today, families only spend about one-seventh of their income on food, and our current measure fails to capture the costs of basic necessities such as clothing, utilities, and shelter.

What we define as poverty no longer reflects at all what it really means to

be poor in this country. Using our current method of measuring poverty, we don't even consider a family of four making just \$23,000 poor. There's something wrong with our formula, and a majority of Americans agree with a higher threshold.

Senator Daniel Patrick Moynihan famously said, "You can't solve a problem until you first learn how to measure it." We are making great progress in moving toward the publication of a new measure of poverty that reflects the economic and social realities in this country. An accurate measurement is essential in determining how to best tackle this problem. If the moral cause of helping the poor doesn't serve as motivation to help struggling Americans rise out of poverty, maybe the economic argument will.

Economists estimate that persistent child poverty alone costs our society an estimated \$500 million a year in lost productivity and increased spending on health care and the criminal justice system. More and more Americans are slipping through the mesh of our badly tattered safety net, and we are at risk of losing an entire generation.

As Congress discusses PAYGO and the deficit reduction agenda, I often hear the rhetoric that we can't drive up the deficit on the backs of our children. But we cannot abandon the needs of vulnerable groups with little political voice and certainly few lobbyists on K Street. Because the voices of the least among us are too often drowned out, we must take opportunities like this to draw attention to the realities facing poor Americans. Awareness is a critical step in finding solutions to improve the well-being of those living in poverty, so let us affirm the recognition of January as Poverty in America Awareness Month.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today in support of House Resolution 1024, which expresses support for designating January as Poverty in America Awareness Month.

As I'm sure my colleagues would agree, awareness of poverty is something that Congress should never lose sight of, not for one single day. But it also should be noted that poverty can only be eliminated in this country when there are jobs available for every able-bodied man and woman. I know this firsthand because I grew up in poverty. I know that the only way that my mother helped get my brother and me out of poverty was by having a great work ethic and working her way out of poverty.

The government does not create jobs; small businesses do. The American people know this even if the majority in Congress does not. That is why CNN is reporting that 75 percent of Americans polled believe that at least half of the stimulus has been wasted, and a third of those believe that it actually has made the economy worse.

In a perfect world, the President could hold a jobs summit and everyone would breathe a sigh of relief as they went off to new jobs created. But in the real world, sitting around and talking about jobs does not magically make them appear. In a perfect world, the money to pay for the stimulus and the endless unemployment extensions would come from a magic tree growing on the South Lawn of the White House. But we know that unemployment benefits are no real substitute for a paycheck. We know that the stimulus didn't work. And we know that the closest thing the government has to a money tree is the money that it takes out of taxpayers' pockets.

The bottom line is, if they are serious about reducing poverty, the President and my Democrat colleagues need to stop talking about jobs and start working with Republicans to support and facilitate an economy that will create them. Specifically, the Democrats, who control the progress of legislation in this town, should do three things:

First, they need to end their obsession with the trillion-dollar takeover of health care, because this single-minded approach is coming at the expense of everything else that matters to the American public.

Second, the tax code should be reformed to protect workers' wages, to encourage investment and entrepreneurship, to reward saving, and to provide the American people with the confidence and certainty about their financial future.

And third, my Democrat colleagues need to take a long, hard look at their failed trillion-dollar stimulus plan and fix it. Don't just borrow another hundred billion dollars here and there and hope that it works better this time.

Raising awareness about poverty is important, and I support this legislation. But before we spend too much time patting ourselves on the back for this feel-good resolution, let us get down to business in a bipartisan manner and really do the hard work of making this economy great again.

With that, Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from Minnesota (Ms. MCCOLLUM).

Ms. MCCOLLUM. In the wealthiest country in the world, far too many of our citizens live in poverty, and the number is growing. Mr. McDERMOTT and Chairman RANGEL, thank you for bringing this important resolution to the floor.

Families in Minnesota and across our country are hurting. The economy may be improving on Wall Street, but on Main Street people are hurting and they're afraid. Unemployed workers are worried about where and how they will find a job and whether they can survive after their unemployment insurance runs out. Our neighbors with jobs are facing hours being cut, facing pay cuts, and they're in fear of also losing their jobs.

The housing crisis has driven families from their homes, and the homeless shelters are filled. Families are sleeping in their cars. Access to basic health care and putting food on the table are now a struggle for far too many Americans. More families are falling below the poverty line and they need our help.

In 2008, one in eight residents of Minnesota's Fourth Congressional District, which I represent, was living in poverty—over 68,000 men, women, children, and seniors. The number is certainly growing with the economic recession, and that means children are going hungry, parents lack day care and reliable transportation to get a job, seniors struggle to pay rent. And yes, many illnesses are left unattended.

Yesterday, I visited a Head Start site in St. Paul, and the staff members there are worried about food insecurity for the children in their classrooms. It is unacceptable that children would go hungry.

The role of the Federal Government is to keep our country safe and to provide an opportunity for people to improve their lives. We have much work to do. But because of the Democrats in Congress passing the Recovery Act, an estimated 60.1 million Americans did not fall below the poverty line, including 66,000 Minnesotans.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentlewoman.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. I urge my colleagues to support this resolution, because if we're going to defeat poverty and create jobs and economic opportunity for all Americans, we need to reach out to get to know those Americans who need our help the most, those in poverty.

Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida. Madam Speaker, in closing, I want to reiterate that there still is much work to be done—and undone—to breathe new life into this economy. The Democrats told Americans that if their stimulus passed, unemployment would stay below 8 percent and millions of Americans would continue receiving paychecks. Instead, the stimulus passed and a record 12 million Americans are now collecting unemployment checks. As predicted, that is triggering massive State tax hikes that will continue for years to come.

Frankly, Madam Speaker, that is why the stimulus isn't working. Every dollar spent by government is a dollar that first must be taken out of the economy. That dollar of government spending is a dollar that a business owner can use to hire a new worker and it's a dollar that a mother can use to feed her child.

My colleagues will say that this is what the stimulus was supposed to do, but what they won't tell you is that the government wastes 50 cents collecting that dollar and fumbling around trying to put it back into the

economy. As part of our awareness of poverty, let us also be aware of that.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, today I rise in support of House Resolution 1024 "Expressing support for designation of January as poverty in America awareness month." This resolution seeks to designate the month of January as an official "Poverty in America Awareness Month," and also expresses the sentiments of the House of Representatives that eradicating poverty in the United States should be the goal of all American citizens—especially those in government positions.

Over the last several decades the numbers of people living in poverty in the United States has steadily increased to a high point in 2008 of over 39 million Americans living below the Federal poverty line.

This is a particularly important issue for the people living in my home district in Houston, Texas where the number of residents with income below the poverty level in 2007 was 20.7 percent, which is several percentage points higher than the Texas State average of 16.3 percent.

These problems have been further exacerbated by the recent economic downturn which has pushed many American families to a financial breaking point. Over the past 10 years much of the progress that was made during the 1990s was reversed as the overall poverty rate increased by 1.9 percent.

As the Chairwoman of the Congressional Children's Caucus I also understand the severe impact that poverty can have on children in the United States. In fact, 14 million of the 39 million Americans currently living below the poverty line are children. For children, growing up in poverty can have numerous negative effects on development ranging from malnutrition to poor education.

As Americans we can not allow underprivileged children in our Nation to be overlooked and ignored. We must ensure that all children of all income levels in this country are provided with quality education, proper nutrition and access to support services.

Furthermore, we can not allow hard-working American citizens to continue to fall below the Federal poverty line. That is why it is important that we support this resolution as it would bring further attention to this important matter and provide an opportunity to reverse the growing trend of poverty in the United States.

Officially establishing the month of January as "Poverty in America Awareness Month," would seek to improve the lives of our citizens as well as increase advocacy for some of the most vulnerable families in our Nation.

I urge my colleagues to support this resolution. I also ask my colleagues for their continued support for the 39 million Americans currently living in poverty.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I rise today to applaud the actions of the House of Representatives in addressing poverty in America and designating January as Poverty in America Awareness Month. I strongly support H. Res. 1024 and urge my colleagues to support this piece of legislation.

The Census Bureau's poverty statistics are alarming. In 2008, 13.2 percent of people were living in poverty. This statistic was even worse for children under 18 years old. In 2008, 19 percent of children under 18 years old were living in poverty. In my state, Georgia, 14.3 percent of people were living below the poverty level in 2007.

Poverty has many adverse effects on society. Poor Americans are less likely to eat healthy, which leads to poor health. Poor health can make study and work difficult. Poor education and the inability to work can adversely affect individual income, and the American economy as a whole.

This resolution expresses the sense of the House that eradicating poverty in the United States should be the goal for all people in the United States. Further, this resolution recognizes that the severe economic downturn, and double-digit unemployment rate, increases the need for Congress to commit itself to helping individuals and families facing economic hardship.

I join the chairman in urging my colleagues to support this important piece of legislation.

Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Madam Speaker, I urge the adoption of the resolution, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. McDERMOTT) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1024.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 6:30 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 45 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until approximately 6:30 p.m. today.

□ 1833

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. COSTA) at 6 o'clock and 33 minutes p.m.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3726, CASTLE NUGENT NATIONAL HISTORIC SITE ESTABLISHMENT ACT OF 2010; AND FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4474, IDAHO WILDERNESS WATER FACILITIES ACT

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 111-401) on the resolution (H. Res. 1038) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3726) to establish the Castle Nugent National Historic Site at St. Croix, United States Virgin Islands, and for other purposes; and for consideration of the

bill (H.R. 4474) to authorize the continued use of certain water diversions located on National Forest System land in the Frank Church-River of No Return Wilderness and the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness in the State of Idaho, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on motions to suspend the rules previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

H. Res. 990, by the yeas and nays;

H. Res. 1011, by the yeas and nays;

H. Res. 1003, by the yeas and nays.

Proceedings on H. Res. 1024 will resume later this week.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

NATIONAL MENTORING MONTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 990, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 990.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 398, nays 0, not voting 35, as follows:

[Roll No. 17]

YEAS—398

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Adler (NJ)
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Austria
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd
Brady (PA)

Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bright
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite,
Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Cao
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cassidy
Castle
Castor (FL)
Chaffetz
Chandler
Childers
Chu
Clarke
Clay
Clever
Clyburn
Coble

Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Dahlkemper
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Driehaus
Duncan
Edwards (MD)
Edwards (TX)
Ehlers
Ellsworth
Emerson
Engel

Eshoo
Etheridge
Fallin
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Flake
Fleming
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Fox
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Garamendi
Giffords
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gordon (TN)
Granger
Graves
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Guthrie
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Halvorson
Hare
Harman
Harper
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heinrich
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hinchee
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Hunter
Inglis
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee
(TX)
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kilroy
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Kissell
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Kosmas
Kratovil
Kucinich
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (CA)
Lee (NY)

Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebach
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel
E.
Lynch
Mack
Maffei
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey (CO)
Markey (MA)
Marshall
Massa
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McMahon
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Minnick
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (NY)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler (NY)
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Nunes
Nye
Oberstar
Obey
Olson
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascarella
Pastor (AZ)
Paul
Payne
Pence
Perlmutter
Perriello
Peters
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Polis (CO)
Pomeroy
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quigley

Radanovich
Rahall
Rangel
Reichert
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Salazar
Sanchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schauer
Schiff
Schmidt
Schock
Schradner
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sestak
Shadegg
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Souder
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stupak
Sullivan
Sutton
Tanner
Taylor
Teague
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Wasserman
Schultz
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)

Wittman
Wolf

Woolsey
Wu

Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—35

Akin
Alexander
Bachmann
Barrett (SC)
Bishop (GA)
Bocieri
Conyers
Crenshaw
Davis (AL)
Deal (GA)
Delahunt
Ellison

Frank (MA)
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hoekstra
Johnson, E. B.
Kind
King (IA)
Miller (FL)
Moran (VA)
Ortiz

Paulsen
Putnam
Rehberg
Ryan (OH)
Speier
Towns
Turner
Walz
Wamp
Waters
Yarmuth

□ 1859

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CERVICAL HEALTH AWARENESS MONTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TEAGUE). The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1011, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1011.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 400, nays 0, not voting 33, as follows:

[Roll No. 18]

YEAS—400

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Adler (NJ)
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Austria
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bartlett
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Bright

Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite,
Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Cao
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cassidy
Castle
Castor (FL)
Chaffetz
Chandler
Childers
Chu
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman (CO)
Cohen
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)

Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Dahlkemper
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Driehaus
Duncan
Edwards (MD)
Edwards (TX)
Ehlers
Ellsworth
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Fallin
Farr
Fattah
Filner

Flake
Fleming
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Garamendi
Garrett (NJ)
Giffords
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gordon (TN)
Granger
Graves
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Guthrie
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Halvorson
Hare
Harman
Harper
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heinrich
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Hunter
Inglis
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee
(TX)
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kilroy
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Kissell
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Kosmas
Kratovil
Kucinich
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Latta
Lee (CA)
Lee (NY)
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsock

Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luján
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel
E.
Lynch
Mack
Maffei
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey (CO)
Markey (MA)
Marshall
Massa
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McMahon
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Minnick
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (NY)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler (NY)
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Nunes
Nye
Oberstar
Obey
Olson
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Paul
Payne
Pence
Perlmutter
Perriello
Peters
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Polis (CO)
Pomeroy
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quigley
Radanovich
Rahall
Rangel
Reichert
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Roe (TN)

Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Salazar
Sanchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schauer
Schiff
Schmidt
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sestak
Shadegg
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Souder
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stupak
Sullivan
Sutton
Tanner
Taylor
Teague
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Wasserman
Schultz
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—33

Akin
Alexander
Bachmann
Barrett (SC)
Barton (TX)
Bishop (GA)
Bocieri
Crenshaw
Davis (AL)
Deal (GA)
Delahunt

Ellison
Frank (MA)
Gerlach
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hoekstra
Johnson, E.B.
Kind
King (IA)
LaTourette
Miller (FL)

Moran (VA)
Ortiz
Paulsen
Putnam
Rehberg
Ryan (OH)
Speier
Turner
Walz
Wamp
Waters

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1907

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL INFLUENZA VACCINATION WEEK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1003, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1003, as amended.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 398, nays 2, not voting 33, as follows:

[Roll No. 19]

YEAS—398

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Adler (NJ)
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Austria
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bartlett
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)

Braley (IA)
Bright
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite,
Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cantor
Cao
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Carter
Cassidy
Castle
Castor (FL)
Chaffetz
Chandler
Childers
Chu
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Coffman (CO)

Cohen
Cole
Conaway
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Dahlkemper
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly (IN)
Doyle
Dreier
Driehaus
Duncan
Edwards (MD)
Edwards (TX)
Ehlers
Ellsworth
Emerson
Engel

Eshoo
Etheridge
Fallin
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Flake
Fleming
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gallegly
Garamendi
Garrett (NJ)
Giffords
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gordon (TN)
Granger
Graves
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Guthrie
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Halvorson
Hare
Harman
Harper
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heinrich
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Hunter
Inglis
Inlee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson Lee
(TX)
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kilroy
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Kissell
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Kosmas
Kratovil
Kucinich
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee (CA)
Lee (NY)
Levin
Lewis (CA)

Lewis (GA)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsock
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel
E.
Lynch
Mack
Maffei
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey (CO)
Markey (MA)
Marshall
Massa
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McClintock
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McMahon
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Minnick
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy (NY)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler (NY)
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Nunes
Nye
Oberstar
Obey
Olson
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pence
Perlmutter
Perriello
Peters
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pomeroy
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quigley
Radanovich
Rahall
Rangel
Reichert
Reyes
Richardson

Rodriguez
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Ruppersberger
Ryan (WI)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schauer
Schiff
Schmidt
Schock
Schrader
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sestak
Shadegg
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Skeltton
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Souder
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stupak
Sullivan
Sutton
Tanner
Taylor
Teague
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Titus
Tonko
Towns
Tsongas
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Wasserman
Schultz
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—2

Paul Polis (CO)

NOT VOTING—33

Akin
Alexander
Bachmann
Barrett (SC)
Bishop (GA)
Boccheri
Boehner
Crenshaw
Royce
Deal (GA)
Delahunt
Ellison
Frank (MA)
Gerlach
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hoekstra
Johnson, E.B.
Kennedy
Kind
King (IA)
Miller (FL)

Moran (VA)
Ortiz
Paulsen
Putnam
Rehberg
Ryan (OH)
Speier
Turner
Walz
Wamp
Waters

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes left in the 5-minute vote.

□ 1915

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. WALZ. Madam Speaker, Due to unforeseen circumstances, I was not able to make it to the floor for votes. Had I been in attendance, I would have voted as follows:

On passage of H. Res. 990 under suspension of the rules, "yea"; on passage of H. Res. 1011 under suspension of the rules, "yea"; on passage of H. Res. 1003 under suspension of the rules, "yea."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Madam Speaker, I was unavoidably absent from the Chamber this evening. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall votes, 17, 18 and 19.

HOLOCAUST REMEMBRANCE DAY

(Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. This year marks the 65th anniversary of the liberation of Auschwitz, the largest of the Nazi extermination camps. Over 1 million people were systematically murdered at Auschwitz in gas chambers or shot or tortured or starved to death or any cruel combination. Most of those who perished were Jews, but others that Nazis perceived as enemies were also murdered there.

As we honor the victims of the Holocaust and those who helped to defeat the Nazis, we must also reaffirm our commitment to enhancing Holocaust education programs in our schools and urge all countries to bolster their efforts in fighting bigotry, racism and anti-Semitism.

In the words of Elie Wiesel, who is an Auschwitz survivor, "There may be times when we are powerless to prevent injustice, but there must never be a time when we fail to protest." Let our voices be heard loudly and clearly. Never again. Tomorrow is Holocaust

Remembrance Day. Let's honor their struggles every day.

HELP FOR AMERICA'S UNINSURED

(Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, there has been a great deal of controversy that has arisen over what I think is not only good policy but good for America, and that is real health care reform. Today I listened to the story of a mother who lost her son, whose name was Mike. Because he could not get a colonoscopy to determine whether or not he had colon cancer, he is not living today. He could not get it because he did not have insurance.

We need health care reform that allows Americans to have the dignity of health care and, as well, the respect of treatment. I met a man today who is blind because he could not get the treatment while he was going blind to reverse that terrible disability. It could have occurred with good health care, and we must stop allowing 45,000 Americans to die every year because they do not have good health care.

We can do it by putting the bill together, House and Senate, reconciliation, protecting physician-owned hospitals, preventing individuals from being denied insurance because of pre-existing disease, insuring 36 million to 40 million. I ask my colleagues to join for what is best for America.

HONORING COACH DAVE LOOS,
AUSTIN PEAY UNIVERSITY

(Mr. ROE of Tennessee asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to commend Coach Dave Loos, the head basketball coach at my alma mater, Austin Peay University. He has dedicated the majority of his life to coaching basketball.

The year 2009 marked Coach Loos' 20th season as head coach at Austin Peay, where he is also athletic director. During this time, he welcomed his 400th overall head-coaching victory on December 3, 2009. Austin Peay is a member of the Ohio Valley Conference, and this year, Coach Loos became the winningest coach in OVC history.

It has been a privilege to watch Coach Loos interact with his young athletes, recruiting and encouraging them, both as a mentor and as a coach. As Rick Pitino once said, "The key to coaching is not what you do, but the way you do it. The intangibles, the motivational parts of the game are the most important facets of it." A successful coach not only prepares his team for victory but motivates them along the way. Coach Loos accomplishes this each time he sets a foot on the court and has great concern and

appreciation for each of his players, and that is an invaluable trait as a successful coach.

However, his proudest accomplishment is being a dedicated husband to Phyllis, a father, and grandfather. I encourage my colleagues to join me in commending Coach Loos for his service to Austin Peay University.

HONORING COACH DAVE LOOS, UNIVERSITY OF MEMPHIS

(Mr. COHEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I just heard my colleague from east Tennessee make those remarks, and I had to add something because it's typical of what happens up here. The people from east Tennessee forget about the fact that Memphis exists in Tennessee, and Dave Loos started his career and played basketball at the University of Memphis, started his coaching career at the University of Memphis, and is a Memphian as well as a graduate of Austin Peay. And while he attended your school, he coached and attended my law school. He is a class act and wonderful gentleman. I wanted to set the record straight.

HONORING FIRE CHIEF HAROLD WATKINS, LITTLE MARSH, PENNSYLVANIA

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a man who has been a dedicated volunteer firefighter since 1980, Harold Watkins of Little Marsh, Pennsylvania. Harold has served the Chatham Township Volunteer Fire Company and his community in many capacities. He has held the positions of president, vice president, second assistant chief, and first assistant chief. For the past 15 years, he has been fire chief, and in 2004, he was named Firefighter of the Year. In other words, Harold has done it all in his 29 years of protecting and saving lives. But he has decided it is time to step down.

Firefighting is a family affair for the Watkins family. Harold's wife, Vivian, serves as secretary for the company and helps organize fundraisers. The chief calls Vivian his personal hero for all her hard work. His son, Matthew, was Firefighter of the Year in 2008 and serves as the vice president and was recently elected as second assistant chief, following in his father's footsteps.

I commend Chief Harold Watkins for his years of dedication and service saving lives and property in Chatham Township. And I know the community joins me in wishing him all the best in retirement.

RECOGNIZING RUTH MOYER ELEMENTARY SCHOOL IN FORT THOMAS, KENTUCKY

(Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the students, faculty, and staff at Ruth Moyer Elementary School in Fort Thomas, Kentucky. Last fall, Ruth Moyer was named a 2009 Blue Ribbon School. The Blue Ribbon Schools program honors schools that are academically superior or demonstrate dramatic gains in student achievement at all levels. These schools are models for others throughout the Nation.

I had the opportunity to meet students and faculty at Ruth Moyer and speak with them about their efforts to improve their school. The students and staff were unable to be here today in Washington to receive our congratulations because they are working hard in the classroom to uphold their high standards. However, the students in Mrs. Greene's class sent a distinguished ambassador to represent them in Washington.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in welcoming Flat Stanley from Fort Thomas, Kentucky, to the House of Representatives and extending our congratulations to the community at Ruth Moyer Elementary for their outstanding achievement.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

BOOKS, NOT BOMBS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I want to call the House's attention to the work of Greg Mortenson, who has built schools in Pakistan and Afghanistan and written two bestsellers about it. Mr. Mortenson has a lot to say about the power of education to dramatically improve the lives of people, especially girls and women, and how education can bring peace to the world.

Mr. Mortenson began his work in Pakistan, where he originally went to climb K2, the world's second-tallest mountain. After the climb, he was very ill, and he was helped by the people of an impoverished village. To thank them, Mr. Mortenson built the town's first school. He wrote a widely acclaimed book about the project called "Three Cups of Tea: One Man's Mission to Promote Peace . . . One School at a Time." Mr. Mortenson then went on to build schools in Afghanistan.

So far, he has built 131 schools, educating 58,000 children with a special

emphasis on education for girls. He has written a second book about his remarkable work entitled, "Stones Into Schools: Promoting Peace With Books, Not Bombs, in Afghanistan and Pakistan."

□ 1930

Mr. Speaker, in a recent interview with Bill Moyers, Mortenson explains how the education of girls can transform lives and whole countries. He said, and I quote, "The education of girls has very powerful impacts on society. Number one, infant mortality is reduced. Number two, the population is reduced. And, number three, the quality of health improves."

Mr. Speaker, he also explained how the education of girls can be a powerful weapon against terrorism. He said, "Culturally, when someone goes on jihad they should get permission from their mother first. If they don't, it's very shameful. But when women are educated, they are less likely to encourage their sons to get into violence. I've seen that happen over the last decade in rural areas of Afghanistan and Pakistan."

Mr. Speaker, in fact, Mortenson said that when men leave the Taliban, it's often because their mothers said what you're doing is not a good thing. It's not in the name of Islam. He went on to say, "I ask widows and women in rural areas in Pakistan and Afghanistan, what do you want? They say, we don't want our babies to die, and we want our children to go to school." Mr. Speaker, he said, "we need to listen to those women. It doesn't mean we just go around the world holding hands and drinking tea and having peace." Actually, I would say, as an aside, why not.

But he continued that he really did "believe that there's a lot of power behind love and compassion and resisting and listening to people." Now, some people might call Mr. Mortenson a fuzzy-brained peacenik, but he isn't. Far from it. He opposes the Taliban and he believes that there's a place for American troops in Afghanistan. His books have even influenced our military commanders, including General McChrystal and General Petraeus.

Admiral Mike Mullen, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, has made Mr. Mortenson an adviser. So Mr. Mortenson isn't saying let's pick up and leave Afghanistan and sing "Kumbaya." But he does want to change our mission there, as I do. He wants to see much more emphasis on diplomacy, economic development, better policing, a better legal system to protect women's rights and of course, more schools.

These are some of the cornerstones of SMART security, which I've been advocating because, Mr. Speaker, President Obama is sending 30,000 more troops to Afghanistan. It will cost \$1 million per year to support each of those soldiers. Greg Mortenson says that we could build 30 to 40 schools with \$1 million and educate up to 30,000 young people

for the cost of one soldier. I think that's a far better way to win the hearts and minds of the Afghan people and defeat violent terrorism.

Mr. Mortenson is really on to something. I think we should all listen to what he has to say. There has to be a smarter way.

THE AMERICANS WHO DRIVE TRUCKS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, freedom and liberty have always been the American ideal. Core American values have not changed over the centuries. Take a look at the Declaration of Independence and the Bill of Rights, and America's values are written down for us. The Declaration acknowledges that our rights come from God, not from government. Life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness are manifested in the Constitution, not granted by the Constitution.

The government doesn't give us our rights, and they can't take them away. Government has no rights. People have rights. Government has power. Government gets power when we give up our rights to government. The American people have made it plain they don't want the government taking over health care. That's not compatible with liberty. America does believe in freedom, that includes freedom of religion and the freedom to exercise our religion. They believe in freedom of the press and the right to peaceably assemble and speak their minds to a government that is not allowed to stop them, especially if the government doesn't like what the people are saying. Americans believe in the God-given right to defend themselves, their families, their homes and their property. We have a right to be free from illegal search and seizure. And the American people believe in fair trials, fair courts and fair play. These are all core American values. They are in the Constitution. Most Americans believe these rights don't change with time. And most of the Americans I represent in Texas believe all these values are fairly well set in stone.

Now, some of these Americans drive trucks, or pickups as we call them. Recently, there have been some derogatory, disrespectful statements made by those who arrogantly dismiss truck owners. However, there are a lot of vocal truck owners in America. The Ford F-150 pickup is the most popular vehicle sold in the United States for the last 28 years; 25 percent of all vehicles sold in America are pickups. And if you add SUVs to the mix, 40 percent of all truck sales, including pickups, are sold to women. Over 40 percent consider their truck more important than their home. As one truck owner told me, "You can sleep in your truck, but you can't drive your house."

Not surprisingly, Texas is America's biggest pickup market, and you don't see too many Volvo station wagons where I come from. These Americans who drive trucks, in my opinion, are fiercely independent, outspoken and will tell you they don't belong to a party but they vote for the person. These drivers are of every race and age, and 64 percent say their truck is a manifestation of their character, their personality and their politics.

Truck owners are one voice in America that government would do well to listen to. Contrary to current Washington wisdom, the Americans I know and represent, like truck drivers and others, do not look forward to a day when government, in the name of progressive politics, makes all our decisions for us. This is not a country of weak, timid souls who think government is the answer to every problem and has a better solution than the individuals it rules over. This is not a people of sheep who are afraid to control their own lives and believe government knows best. This is a country of high-spirited individuals that want to be left alone.

Many people I represent believe government is a wolf seeking what liberties it can devour from the people. Americans don't believe our health should be turned over to the Federal Government and made a budget item. We don't want some government bureaucrat deciding we can't have the pacemaker surgery, just take pain killers. That will not work for America. After all, we're not some nanny state, European-style.

Truck owners and other Americans believe in transparent government, not smoky back-room deals that have an odor of corruption, payoffs, and paybacks. The Americans I know believe in hard work and a private economy that rewards hard work with jobs open to every citizen. They believe in enjoying the fruits of their own labor, and they know how better to spend their money than Big Government. Americans believe in giving people a helping hand when they need it, but don't believe in creating a dependent class of people.

Truck owners don't believe in an elite ruling class of D.C. insiders making decisions for the rest of us. Mr. Speaker, I think most Americans believe in the American Dream which is simply this: freedom. This Nation was founded on freedom, and we don't want the government micromanaging our lives. The Americans I know, especially those that drive trucks, want government to remember the beginning of the Constitution, which says, "We, the people." After all, it doesn't say, we the subjects. And as one bumper sticker on a pickup stated, "I love America. It's government I continue to worry about."

And that's just the way it is.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gen-

tleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DEFAZIO addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

UNDERSTANDING THE ECONOMY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, the Joint Economic Committee, which I chair, has just released a report entitled "Understanding the Economy, State by State." The report provides quick and easy access to the major economic indicators for all 50 States in the areas of jobs, unemployment, personal earnings, and housing. It paints a by-the-numbers picture of the current economic reality in each of our 50 States. Every picture tells a story that is at once both informative and sobering.

The report captures the enormity of the economic damage caused by the Great Recession that began in December of 2007, while making clear that the United States economy has improved and begun to grow since the Bush administration left office. And this shows that the last month the Bush administration was in office this country lost over 750,000 jobs. Nationally, there has been a substantial decrease in the rate of job losses. The economy started losing jobs in January of 2008, increasing at a rapid rate throughout the year. The average quarterly job loss has now declined from a staggering 691,000 jobs lost per month in the first quarter of 2009 to 69,000 jobs in the most recent quarter, yet even that number is unacceptable.

And as you delve into the report, it provides a more localized and precise picture for each State. A chart like this is available for all 50 States. This chart, for example, is for my home State of New York. It shows at a glance the monthly change in private payrolls from January of 2008 to December of 2009. You can see that the unemployment rate in New York was 9 percent in December of 2009. That's up 4.4 percentage points from December of 2007. It has been a bumpy road, but you can see clearly that the trend is now in the right direction.

A scatter chart is also included in the report, and for New York State it reveals at a glance that the unemployment rate is below the national rate, and that total job losses have been smaller than U.S. averages. The economies of the States vary enormously. New York's economy depends heavily on information technology and financial services. Some States that are more dependent on construction and manufacturing have been hit much harder by job losses.

An economic overview and outlook accompanies each State chart. The one for New York provides an estimate from the President's Council of Economic Advisers that employment in

New York was boosted by a total of 141,000 jobs through the fourth quarter of 2009 by the investments we made through the Recovery Act. It also shows that real per capita personal income in New York was 43,000 in the third quarter of 2009, down from 45,000 in the third quarter of 2007.

There is also useful information on housing for each State, and it too varies enormously. For instance, the median price for single family homes in New York was \$290,000 in 2008, compared to \$250,000 nationwide. And in New York in November, housing starts increased by 52 percent over October to a total of 18,000 units at a seasonally adjusted annual rate.

You can review the report online at www.jec.senate.gov. The majority staff will continue to update the data throughout the year in order to track the progress our economy will be making month by month. But from this first edition, it is abundantly clear why this Congress is so focused on job growth. Americans are demanding, and rightly so, that we must do all we can to grow the economy and help create new private sector jobs. The hard facts and real-life consequences of the economic policies of the prior administration don't make for a very pretty picture right now.

Mr. Speaker, stay tuned. The American spirit of innovation is on the way and individual resilience are ready and raring to go.

□ 1945

DON'T LET DEBT DEFEAT A GREAT NATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, soon the Congress will be asked to raise the debt limit of this Nation. This actually happened under the previous administration, and now it's happening under the new administration.

I have not voted, from the time I have been in Congress, to raise this debt ceiling because all this really does is permit our government to borrow more money from foreign governments. I think we all know that we are what is called a debtor nation. We don't pay our bills anymore. We have to go to the Japanese, the Chinese, the UAE, and to many other countries to buy our debt so we can spend more. That is the reason I wanted to come to the floor tonight.

Before we broke for Christmas, FRANK WOLF had sent out to each Member of the House a little pamphlet that says, "Don't Let Debt Defeat a Great Nation." He and JIM COOPER, in a bipartisan way—FRANK WOLF being a Republican; JIM COOPER a Democrat—have introduced H.R. 1557, the SAFE Commission Act, and I want to talk about that in the little bit of time I have.

And I am reading from his publication, Mr. WOLF's publication. "We have amassed massive unfunded 'promises' to guarantee future entitlement benefits that when added with liabilities like the debt, total nearly \$57 trillion. That means every man, woman and child in America owes \$184,000."

I have used this back in my district, and I like to say it this way, Mr. Speaker. When that beautiful baby is born, the first cry out of his or her mouth is a cry of, "Do I owe \$184,000?" Yes, baby, you do owe \$184,000. Every American does.

This could, according to the information from FRANK WOLF, skyrocket to \$21 trillion by the year 2020. How do FRANK WOLF and JIM COOPER, in a bipartisan effort, try to deal with this out-of-control spending? They have introduced, again, H.R. 1557, the SAFE Commission Act. And the actual title on it is the Securing America's Future Economy—SAFE Act.

How does this function? This would create a SAFE Commission. This would be made up of 16 bipartisan appointed people to be on this SAFE Commission Act, and it would be their responsibility to go through how government spends its money, from the entitlements to the spending on education, transportation, health care, national defense, tax policy, and other items. This commission would come back to Congress, if this should become the law, and then Congress would be required to vote up or down on the panels's proposal.

Now, how this panel would come up with this proposal is they would go around this country and they would hold hearings and listen to the American people—something we have not been doing, either party, quite frankly. We are not listening to the American people. Yes, we are now, and after what happened in Massachusetts a couple weeks ago, the American people are being heard and they've been heard by many of us when we go back home and do our own town meetings. But this commission would have the authority, should this become the law, to say to the Congress, You can't duck these votes. You're going to have to vote up or down. I think this is critical.

I would love to hear the President tomorrow night—I hope somebody has made him aware of this bipartisan effort known as the SAFE Commission, and I hope he would say tomorrow night that he would endorse this legislation and encourage the Democratic leadership in the House and the Republican leadership in the House to get behind this bill.

At this present time, Mr. Speaker, we have 109 Members of Congress who have cosponsored this legislation. I hope my other colleagues will look seriously at what Mr. COOPER and Mr. WOLF have done to try to bring to the American people hope that we can meet our obligations based on the Constitution and deal with this out-of-control spending here in Washington, D.C. that both parties are responsible for.

With that, Mr. Speaker, before I leave, as I do every night on the floor, I ask God to please bless our men and women in uniform, to please bless their families, and I ask God to hold in his arms the families who've given a child dying for freedom in Afghanistan and Iraq.

And, Mr. Speaker, three times, I ask God to please, please God, please God, please God, continue to bless America.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. MORAN of Kansas addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

CONGRESSIONAL JOBS NOW CAUCUS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, the single most important concern for Americans throughout our Nation is the vast and growing rate of joblessness. This is not difficult to understand. Bob Herbert asked in a recent New York Times column, "How loud do alarm bells have to ring?"

More than 15 million Americans—more than 1 in 10 people—are out of work. Another 15 million people are underemployed or have quit looking. That means that over 30 million Americans want to work but cannot find the job they want. More people join their ranks every single day. Worse, 4 in 10 unemployed workers have been jobless for 27 weeks or longer.

Yes, we have a jobs crisis in our country, and it's everybody's number one issue. That's why I joined with colleagues on both sides of the aisle to form the Congressional Jobs Now Caucus, to keep the focus where it needs to be. That's why I sponsored bills to create jobs in America to stem our rising trade deficits and to bring justice to Wall Street, which has shut down normal lending across this country, contributing to the jobs crisis.

Job creation is not a Republican issue or a Democratic issue. We are all in this together. Last month, Toledo, a city I represent, lost an additional 1,200 jobs. Added to the yearly tally, more than 38,600 individuals, or 11.8 percent of the city's population, are without work.

The unemployment rate in the adjoining rural Ottawa County, also in our district, is now over 17 percent. Again, these are official numbers which did not include those who have part-time jobs and need more hours or those who have simply given up because there are no jobs to be had.

Job creation is not just an urban issue. The damage has spread to the suburbs of our country, and no one is safe from the jobs hemorrhage. In fact,

a recent study by the Brookings Institute, as examined by Mr. Herbert in his article, found that the largest and fastest-growing population of poor people in the United States are in the suburbs.

The number of poor people in our country grew by 5.2 million when President Bush was President between 2002 and 2008, and more than 90 million Americans—90 million; that's a third of our country—are living on less than \$21,834 for a family of four. The alarm bells are roaring.

At the same time, the basic goodness and generosity of the American people remains one of our greatest strengths. Through it all, the American people remain compassionate and caring. Last weekend, a local television station in our region organized a telethon for relief to Haiti. Even with double-digit unemployment and great economic uncertainty, the people of our community opened their hearts to the people they've never seen in a country most of them have never visited and donated tens of thousands of dollars to that end.

For our community and our country, the first alarm bells started ringing with the empty promises and rapid failure of NAFTA as it outsourced jobs everywhere, certainly to Mexico. The next alarm bell rang every time another trade deal came down the pike that took more of our jobs that used to exist in this country and doled them out to every undemocratic place in the world.

You can't make televisions in our country anymore—not a single one is made here—or clothing, or cars, or electrical parts, or even toys. More and more, even our food is being imported. You mean we are falling behind in even that?

There was plenty of warning, but big business and big money insisted on the right to seek out the lowest common denominator in the most undemocratic places, and they found it in China, in Mexico, in Bangladesh, in Pakistan, in Guatemala and every poor, undemocratic place where penny-wage workers are treated like the expendable pieces of equipment that they work with.

In our country, now we need those jobs because people without jobs can't pay mortgages. They can't pay their health insurance. They can't buy cars. They can't plan for their children's future or even get enough food and clothing to meet their families' needs.

Unemployment also means our Federal deficits rise as people can't pay their way forward. Unemployment and COBRA benefits are running out. State funds are depleted. Our private charities are overwhelmed. The American people need work and they need good jobs. It's really that simple. We simply can't rest until we get our economy back on track and create jobs for everyone who wants to work. I hope it is to this subject—the economy and job creation—that President Obama will direct his address tomorrow night.

We know that under President Bush we were hemorrhaging 734,000 jobs

when he left at the end of his term, and though we haven't been losing as many jobs, now is the time during this fiscal year where we need to do more for our people to put them back to work, to use that productive energy to help pull our country forward rather than allow her to continue to fall behind, and that begins with work for every single American who needs a job.

PRESIDENT OBAMA'S BUDGET FREEZE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I listened to my colleagues, and I think we are all of one accord when we say we want to see jobs created in this country and we want to see the unemployment rate go down. But the way you do that is the way Ronald Reagan did it when he was President. And he came in when we had 12 percent unemployment and 14 percent inflation. He came in and he cut taxes across the board. What are we doing instead?

Well, since January when the President took office, we have spent \$73.3 billion that we didn't have on one program. We spent \$1.6 trillion, including interest, on the stimulus bill; the omnibus spending bill, \$410 billion. If you add interest, that's \$625 billion. In June, we spent \$106 billion, with a lot of pork in it, on the defense supplemental; and then on the consolidated appropriation bill, the mini-omnibus bill we passed in December, it was \$3.5 trillion.

And then you include the things that we passed in this House which have not been enacted into law like cap-and-trade. That's \$846 billion in new taxes. And the proposed government-run health care program, if it were to pass, it would cost between \$1 trillion and \$3 trillion.

Now, since the opposition party, under Speaker PELOSI, took control of this body, the Federal deficit has increased from \$162 billion the first year she was Speaker in 2007 to \$459 billion in 2008. And then it went up by a huge amount to \$1.42 trillion in 2009. This is just an unsustainable growth rate.

And over the last 3 years, we have increased the debt ceiling five times since she took office as Speaker. This is something that's unbelievable. It went from \$8.97 trillion in January of 2007 to \$12.39 trillion today, which is an increase of \$3.4 trillion, or 38 percent, in just 3 years. Now you're talking about spending \$3 trillion a year—more than half of that borrowed money—and we are talking about how we are going to get control of it.

Tomorrow night the President is going to be speaking from right there just below the Speaker's lectern, and the President is going to try to address our economic problems. And as I understand it from some of the reports that have come out, he is going to talk

about freezing spending, or a partial freeze, over the next 3 years that would reduce the budget by less than 1 percent, or \$15 billion, in the first year.

Now, don't get me wrong. I am for freezing spending. But when you look at what has happened in the last year or two, especially during the last year, it's unbelievable. We had an 8 percent boost in spending in the omnibus bill the President signed into law in March and a 12 percent boost that he signed in right at the end of last year in December. We're spending money like it's going out of style.

Now, what is the answer? The answer is that we get together and realize the way to create jobs is to stimulate the private sector, and that is by cutting taxes, cutting personal income taxes, cutting corporate taxes, cutting capital gains taxes. That will give business, industry, and individuals more disposable income for investment and to buy products. If the government continues to spend like we're doing right now, we're digging ourselves into a deeper and deeper hole, and it is not going to solve the unemployment problem.

I heard some of my colleagues down there talking about how things are getting better. We just had 10½ percent unemployment. Now it's at least 10 percent unemployment. And when you add in those who are working part-time who want a full-time job, it's probably more like 17 or 18 percent of the people that are either out of work or have given up.

□ 2000

It's just terrible. So what do we do? We ought to do what has been done by John F. Kennedy in the past and what Ronald Reagan did when he was President. And that is to say, let's cut taxes. Let's give a shot in the arm to the private sector. They create jobs. Government cannot and will not create jobs by spending, spending, spending.

Tomorrow night when the President speaks, he will get a lot of applause from probably both sides of the aisle when he says some of the things he is going to say. But the thing that concerns me the most is the "spending freeze" he is talking about. It's not really anything but a drop in the bucket. It's not even a drop in the bucket when you talk about a 1 percent spending freeze over the next 3 years, when you're talking about a multitrillion-dollar deficit that goes on and on and on, and you're talking about a spending freeze that is going to save maybe \$4 billion or \$5 billion. It's just nothing.

So I would admonish the President, or suggest to the President, that he start moving toward cutting taxes, stimulate the private sector and cut the huge deficit spending we are facing.

A PACT WITH THE DEVIL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GRAYSON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Speaker, now that help to Haiti is on the way and that we are doing the best we can to save lives and to reconstruct lives in that torn country, I think this is a good time to look back and to give some thought to people's reaction to what happened in Haiti, to do sort of a post-mortem of the post-mortem. And particularly I want to revisit one comment that was made after that time, the comment by Pat Robertson. He claimed that the earthquake in Haiti was the result of a pact with the devil that the people of Haiti had made to achieve an end to slavery and independence at the beginning of the 1800s.

I thought that was an interesting comment to make. It turns out that there were two devastating earthquakes in Haiti before their independence, before their so-called pact with the devil, before their end to slavery. And in the 200 years plus since their so-called pact with the devil, Haiti has actually been pretty much earthquake-free.

Now you compare that to the neighboring country, the Dominican Republic. In 1946, the Dominican Republic had a devastating earthquake, actually, it's hard to believe, ten times more powerful than the earthquake that Haiti experienced 2 weeks ago. The Dominican Republic had no pact with the devil, and therefore, if I can use the word "therefore" in this context, was laid low. So under Pat Robertson's logic, one would have to conclude that, in fact, Haiti has benefitted tremendously by what he would depict as a pact with the devil.

And I wonder, in contrast, how well Pat Robertson's followers have made out with their own pact with the devil. And what I mean is this: Pat Robertson ran for President in 1988. He did something in that year that nobody has done before or since. He brought 3 million volunteers to his campaign. He got millions of people involved in the Republican Party all across the country. In the end, he came in third. But he activated the Christian right. And all those people joined the Republican Party with something in mind, a couple of things in mind. One thing they wanted was an end to gay marriage. And for years, when the Republican Party was in charge of this country, the House, the Senate, the Supreme Court, the Presidency, the Republican Party did nothing to accomplish that for Pat Robertson's followers.

Similarly, these people wanted an end to abortion in America. And I'm not going to say whether that was right or wrong, whether they are right or wrong, but I will point out to you that when the Republicans were in charge, the House, the Senate, the White House and the Supreme Court, once again, they did nothing to help Pat Robertson's followers accomplish what they wanted.

So tonight I ask those people, the Christian right: What about your own pact with the devil? How has that worked out for you?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. FORTENBERRY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. FORTENBERRY addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DREIER addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

NEW ORLEANS SAINTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Orleans (Mr. CAO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CAO. Mr. Speaker, the New Orleans Saints are going to the Super Bowl for first time in franchise history. As their representative to Congress, I want to congratulate them in an official manner by acknowledging words of encouragement from constituents on the House floor.

Sunday's thrilling and historic win was an inspiration to the residents of Orleans and Jefferson Parishes, who continue to struggle to rebuild their lives 4 years after Hurricane Katrina. I'm proud to be their Congressman, and I look forward to an exciting Super Bowl in which they will defeat the Indianapolis Colts.

Tonight, I will read several statements from my district in their honor. The first statement is from Kay Higginbotham, a teacher at the Academy of the Sacred Heart in New Orleans. Kay writes, Do the Saints have an impact on education? As a school administrator, I believe the impact is immeasurable and far exceeds economics. The value lessons are much greater than an awareness of team colors. Students certainly enjoy spirit days or completing math problems with a Saints bent, but they also spend time discussing the job of a professional athlete, what it means to stay focused, eat healthy food, get plenty of exercise and sleep, follow rules, work as a team, and be a good sport, win or lose.

Teachers help students understand the importance of following parent and teacher directives, and when talking about the Saints, they link it to the attention each player must pay to the coaches' play-calling. They discuss the pride one feels in the hard work of a job well done, the discipline it takes to make a wise choice, both on and off the field, and the consequences that ensue if one doesn't.

Is the job of a student so different from the job of a New Orleans Saint? When interviewed, Saints players speak about having faith in their team and giving back to the community. They talk about developing self-confidence and leadership and overcoming

adversity, values important in a game, but even more important in life. And parents report something incredible: Dinner conversations that include the whole family. Brothers are amazed at how much their sisters understand about first-downs and touchdowns. And sisters actually want to hear what their brothers know about Drew Brees and Reggie Bush.

Do the Saints have an impact on education? Yes, indeed. They give us lessons worth teaching and learning.

The second statement is from Cindy Hilbrink of New Orleans. Cindy writes, While city accountants calculate the financial impact of the Saints football team to New Orleans, citizens know, as one writer to the local paper said, that despite failures of Federal, State, and local governments after Katrina, and suggestions that we don't merit help, we are, nevertheless, deserving—deserving of a winning team, of good schools, the best health care, safe roads, bridges and reliable levees.

When the population was only trickling back into New Orleans that summer of 2006 after Hurricane Katrina, when politicians and pundits urged that the city be abandoned, the sign on the dominant building in New Orleans, the Superdome, with its patched roof and iconic status as the symbol of suffering, said, 'Our team, our home.'

Bumper stickers in the Saints' black font read, 'Faith.' Drew Brees, the new quarterback who took a chance on the team and the city, printed T-shirts to benefit children that implored, 'Believe, New Orleans!' A popular Saints song contends 'This is the way we live,' meaning we are enabled to survive by clinging to our faith in this team. Our devotion to the New Orleans Saints, win or lose, keeps our battered spirits alive.

Finally, I want to close tonight with a prayer for the Saints delivered by Archbishop Philip Hannan at the first Saints and Sinners banquet in 1968.

Our heavenly Father, who has instructed us that the Saints by faith conquered kingdoms and overcame lions, grant our Saints an increase of faith and strength so that they will not only overcome the Lions, but also the Bears, the Rams, the Giants and even those awesome people in Green Bay. May they continue to tame the Redskins and fetter the Falcons as well as the Eagles. Give to our owners and coaches the continued ability to be as wise as serpents and simple as doves, so that no good talent will dodge our draft. Grant to our fans perseverance in their devotion and unlimited lung power, tempered with a sense of charity to all, including the referees.

May our beloved Bedlam Bowl be a source of good fellowship, and may "The Saints Come Marching In" be a victory march for all, now and in eternity.

THE AGONY OF THE CENTRAL VALLEY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. DAHLKEMPER). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Madam Speaker, for many months, the Republicans on the Water and Power Subcommittee of the Natural Resources Committee have implored the majority Democrats to hold a hearing in the Central Valley of California to see and hear for themselves the damage that the Federal Government has caused by diverting 200 billion gallons of water from Central Valley farms in order to indulge the environmental left's pet cause, the delta smelt.

After our pleas were met with continued stonewalling, we decided to hold a forum under our own auspices and to invite all members of the California congressional delegation, all members of the Natural Resources Committee and representatives of the Obama administration to come to Fresno to see firsthand what these policies have wrought.

Instead, after we had announced the forum, the Water and Power Subcommittee chairwoman decided to meet on the same day in southern California to extol the virtues of water conservation. Congress has thus made clear its intention to sacrifice the people of the San Joaquin Valley upon the altar of environmental extremism.

Despite heavy rains over the past month, the administration continues to blame a relatively mild drought for the fact that Valley farmers will receive only 5 percent of the water that they are entitled to. This does not explain how, in far more severe droughts than this, Valley farmers have received far greater allocations. Nor does it explain how these massive water diversions can be justified to support the delta smelt if indeed supplies were constrained.

Had the Democrats in the subcommittee come to Fresno, they would have heard and seen the anguish of the people of the Central Valley of California. These water diversions have destroyed a half-million acres of the most productive farmland in America, and they have thrown 30,000 Central Valley farm families into unemployment.

They would have heard the stories of food lines in communities that once prided themselves on being the breadbasket of the Western United States. They would have heard about the frustration of seeing produce imported from China being handed out in these food lines to the very same American farmers who once supplied the very same produce to the entire world.

And they would have seen the anger as the absent Interior Secretary's testimony to the Natural Resources Committee last year was played back, in which Mr. SALAZAR admitted that the Obama administration has the author-

ity to turn the pumps back on, but that it chooses not to do so because that would be "like admitting failure."

There is some good news. This afternoon, the day after our forum in Fresno, the Interior Secretary relented to the extent of releasing 350,000 to 400,000 acre-feet of already allocated water to the Central Valley. Having demonstrated his authority to release the water that Central Valley farmers already own, he now needs to follow through and release the water that is being held hostage to the delta smelt.

Meanwhile, Mr. NUNES of California has introduced H.R. 3105, the Turn on the Pumps Act, which does exactly the same thing that Congress did under far less severe circumstances several years ago for the farmers of New Mexico. Mr. NUNES has filed a discharge petition to bypass that subcommittee and bring the bill directly to the House for a vote. It needs 218 signatures. So far, it has 105, 104 Republicans and one Democrat.

Madam Speaker, I assure you that it is not only the Central Valley that is suffering. The willful destruction of 500,000 acres of American farmland by these massive water diversions, all for the enjoyment and amusement of the 3-inch long delta smelt, is reflected in the rising prices for produce that families are feeling far beyond the congressionally created dust bowl of California's Central Valley.

Nor is the delta smelt doing any better. Despite these massive water diversions, the delta smelt population fell back to the historic low in 2005 and is now well below the high points recorded in the late 1970s. Given these findings, how can anybody argue that the delta pumping restrictions are benefiting the delta smelt?

Madam Speaker, I promised to carry the plea from the many Americans who poured out their hearts to us in Fresno on Monday for Congress to come to the Central Valley and see what their policies have caused. I place their invitation before you.

REBUILDING THE ECONOMY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. PERRIELLO) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. PERRIELLO. Madam Speaker, I rise today as one of many freshmen who will be speaking during this hour because a little over a year ago, we came in on a wave of change. Many of us came into politics for the first time, certainly to the Federal Government for the first time, because we believed this country needed a new kind of politics, not just a politics of right or left, but a politics of right and wrong. For too long, both parties had failed to rise to the challenges of our time. Energy independence, redefining our competitive advantage—there were so many challenges to take on. And a year later, we are not satisfied.

Tomorrow night, the President of the United States will come and join us here in this body to speak and give us a report on the state of the Nation. Well, the Nation is in pain. Working and middle class families are in pain, and we haven't done nearly enough to show people the results of standing up for the working and middle class.

□ 2015

There are many things that the change was about, but certainly at the heart of it was a desire for a new era of accountability, accountability for the private sector, accountability for government, and even accountability for consumers and bad decisions that had been made.

But most importantly to this was a need to shift our economic policies from speculation on Wall Street to job creation on Main Street. Changing the name plate on the door from Hank Paulson to Tim Geithner does not represent a change of economic policy. We need to understand what it will take to have actual economic accountability and job growth in this country.

We believe in this House, the people's House, we have taken dramatic steps to put working class and middle class people ahead of the most powerful among us. But the pain continues. In my district over the last 5 years we have seen people's utility rates go up 93 percent by Appalachian Power and others. We get calls every day, 20 percent increases in their health insurance premiums, bank fees, credit card fees, Comcast fees, all going through the roof while the working and middle class pay the price.

We have taken steps here to stand up and say someone is going to stand up for Main Street, demand that accountability and that economic relief that we thought was part of the change. We hope tomorrow night to hear more about your willingness to lead in these areas.

But we also must switch this focus to Main Street because we are in a jobs crisis. We need a wartime-like mentality of how serious this job crisis is. And we took dramatic efforts a year ago that have helped to stop the bleeding, to help turn from some of the most dramatic job losses in American history, certainly modern American history under the last administration, to stopping that bleeding so that we could begin the recovery. But we know much more needs to be done. We are not satisfied.

I hear time and time again the banks are still not lending. If we need to do direct lending, if we need to do more to get the lending going to small and medium-sized businesses, we have to understand that in America's economy today two-thirds of job creation comes from small- and medium-sized business. They may not have the political power and control over both parties in this town, but small- and medium-sized businesses create that job growth. We need to get job creation on Main Street

through direct lending. We also need to see the kind of investment in our infrastructure not only because it puts people to work today, but because it rebuilds America's competitive advantage.

The hardworking, proud people of my district would rather collect a paycheck for building something than an unemployment check for sitting home. People want to work. They don't want those holes in their resume. And we know we are being outcompeted. So this is a jobs crisis. But it also goes to the heart of restoring the capitalistic innovation in this country.

We saw a policy under the last administration of rewarding failure with bailouts. Many of us wanted a change in that policy. We are not satisfied with what we have seen. We cannot have the strength of our private sector when we continue to reward failure instead of innovation. The people's House has taken bold moves to ensure the kind of accountability that will restore the very heart of our capitalism.

We know that the other side put in place many of the policies that created this problem, but it is not enough to point the finger. Let us be judged not by what the other side did to get us here, but by what we did to get us out of this economic mess. Many of us came here, we are working a double shift every day and will not rest until we see the kind of job creation and rewards for innovation that the American people deserve. That is why many of us came here. And we are not satisfied. We want to continue being that change, demanding that kind of shift from speculation on Wall Street to job creation on Main Street.

With that, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. DRIEHAUS. I would thank, Madam Chair, the gentleman from Virginia for leading this hour on our recovery. We talk so much about the job loss that has been created by this Great Recession. But far too often we don't discuss the causes of that job loss, and we don't discuss the direction we are heading in. And so I think it is important to remind the viewers and remind all Americans just where we are.

I was at a luncheon today in Cincinnati, Ohio, with Johnson Investment Counsel. They refer to this as the Great Recession. And they refer to it as the Great Recession because it is the most significant recession that has taken place since the 1930s in the United States.

This recession has lasted for 18 months, longer than any other recession since the Great Depression. This recession has caused a loss of 3.8 percent of the gross domestic product here in the United States, a greater loss than any recession since the Great Depression. This recession has caused the loss of 7.2 million jobs. 7.2 million jobs. The greatest job loss since the Great Depression.

But I think it is important to understand when this recession started. This

recession started in 2007, under the policies of the Bush administration. And I know the other side doesn't like us to go back. They want to believe that the world began, that this recession began, in January of 2009. But the facts just don't bear that out.

So I brought this chart. And I brought this chart to explain the job loss that has occurred during this recession. And you can see that in the last 3 months of the Bush administration, this economy lost nearly 2 million jobs. In the last 3 months of the Bush administration alone. As a matter of fact, it is after President Obama took the oath of office that we started turning things around. We are still losing jobs. And I think we all hope that next quarter we will turn this around and see positive growth. We saw growth last quarter. But we are heading in the right direction. And that is the important thing.

Also at the luncheon today, I was struck by the analysis given. And I will just mention the first few points. First of all, the Great Recession is over. The recovery has begun. And I think this is important. Near-term growth has been bolstered by the stimulus and inventory building. There is no question in the minds of economists around the country that the stimulus is working.

I would point you, Mr. PERRIELLO, to just one comment made in the Cincinnati Enquirer this week. It was by the Realtors of Cincinnati. And the Realtors of Cincinnati were praising the stimulus. The headline reads this: "Realtors, Builders Laud Tax Credit." They are praising the tax credit that we passed as a part of the stimulus. Because oftentimes when we talk about the stimulus, this \$800 billion package, we forget that \$300 billion of it was tax credits. It was tax credits and tax breaks for moderate-income families. And an important credit was to stimulate first-time homebuyers and to help people get back in the housing market. We have achieved that. Realtors understand that, people around the country understand it, because homes are starting to sell. And it is thanks to the efforts of this Democratic Caucus.

Mr. PERRIELLO. Let me yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Thank you.

Madam Speaker, it is a great honor to be here with the other freshmen. We are new to this system, but we are not new to the problems in our districts or in our Nation. We often go home on weekends to spend time in our districts. And what I have found in the district that I represent and the East Bay of California is a lot of pain, a lot of people that are suffering, but are filled with hope with the possibility that things are indeed turning around.

I met a carpenter 2 weekends ago. He is a member of the carpenters union, and he had been out of work for about 8 months. The housing industry had literally shut down, and he had been thrown aside. And he said to me, "Why can't those bankers make loans to my

company? Why can't they do that? They have been given hundreds of billions of dollars, and yet they cannot make a loan." One of the things that we have been working on here is to force those bankers to make loans, to use our tax money not for the great bonuses that they are giving themselves this month, but rather to use that tax money to put people to work with loans to this home construction company that this carpenter was once employed by.

Another person that I met in the City of Antioch about 8 months ago was protesting the fact that the loan modification program that had been put through was stalled once again by the bankers. We all know the statistics. A lot of talk, but very few loan modifications. This person had worked as a painter painting houses, had two jobs to support their family, and yet was unable to continue their mortgage when the Great Recession began.

A third person just this last weekend was a heavy equipment operator at a groundbreaking ceremony for the Caldecott Tunnel in Contra Costa County. The heavy equipment operator said, "Thank God the stimulus is working for me." In that project alone, over a \$300 million project, the State of California was unable to pay its share because of the downturn in the California economy. So it was the action of my colleagues here, the freshman class plus the other Democrats in this House that voted to pass the stimulus bill, and \$197 million of direct stimulus money went into that project, and 6,000 men and women will be employed, and a major commuting backlog will cease.

It is working. The statistics we saw just a moment ago clearly show that with the new administration coming into place, with the stimulus money that was put in place last January, the first vote, supported unanimously by our caucus and opposed unanimously by the other side, that is working. The statistics are clear. We are seeing job declines slowing down, and we will soon see it turn around.

Tomorrow the President will be here speaking to all of us about what we need to do in the months ahead. We need that Jobs for Main Street bill that passed here in December. Get it out there, get it passed, get people to work. We also need to make sure that Wall Street is properly disciplined. If they are going to get those big fat bonuses using our tax money, then we ought to tax those bonuses and put that money back to work with small businesses.

We can do these things. And much has been done. We have seen the turnaround. We have seen the statistics showing that we are on the right track. We will continue that. And for all of us, we have a choice. We can do nothing, and people will be on welfare, people will get the unemployment checks, people will lose their insurance, and we will try to keep them going with COBRA support. Or we can do the jobs

program, the stimulus programs, the Jobs for Main Street program. And in doing that, we will put people to work. They will not be tax takers, they will become taxpayers.

I yield my time.

Mr. PERRIELLO. Thank you very much.

I think it is important to remember we have got to rebuild jobs in this country that are between \$6 an hour and six figures. There still has to be a middle class, a working class in this country. We have to respect those jobs, remember that we have lost jobs in construction, we have lost jobs in places where people want to go back to work.

The jobs bill we passed here was a good start. We need to be bold in our willingness to both put people to work and recreate our competitive advantage. Even before the Great Recession, even before some of the horrible fiscal decisions of the last administration we had been getting outcompeted around the world. We have got to make the investments in our infrastructure, in our small-and medium-sized businesses, and education and workforce development so that we can outcompete any country.

We are more innovative than any country on earth. We will continue to do that. But we cannot do it when we have a corporate capture of this body that means we reward failure instead of rewarding innovation. That must be the key.

With that, I yield to the gentleman from Vermont.

Mr. WELCH. I thank my colleagues, and appreciate the opportunity to participate with you in the freshman hour.

I want to speak about two things. One is how do we get lending going for small businesses. And two, what is a practical thing we can do to create 600,000 to 850,000 jobs. You have recited very well how we got here, why we needed the stimulus. But on lending, let's address that. What happened? Wall Street went on strike. After they made record profits and record bonuses by making record bets with taxpayer money, they put a gun to the head of the American economy and lost billions and billions of dollars. And it was so threatening to the American economy.

Henry Paulson, then the Treasury Secretary under a conservative President, George Bush, came to Congress hat in hand, acknowledged that he was embarrassed, and asked for a \$750 billion bailout.

□ 2030

Now, I was on that conference call with Mr. PAULSON, and many of us were shocked that this former Goldman Sachs head was acknowledging failure but saying, If you don't help us out on the bets we made, we will have an implosion that will have collateral consequences that are absolutely catastrophic for Main Street.

Congress gave him the money, but it was after an assurance on his part that

Wall Street had learned its ways and they wouldn't do the same thing. It is 15 months later, and what has happened? Wall Street is back to its old ways. In this past year, Wall Street has made so much money that they have set aside a bonus pool of \$140 billion to \$160 billion.

Now, how did they make that money? They had the TARP money, the taxpayer bailout money, number one. Number two, they had zero interest rate money from the Federal open window, and they did what they did before to get us there: they went and started trading in currencies, derivatives, and commodities.

Now, with those profits they had three options. One, they could have lent that money out to our small businesses. And they need it. By the way, I have a lot of folks in Vermont, I am sure this is true in California, saying, If they are making so much money, how come they won't give me a loan?

Number two, they could have added it to their bottom line to have a stronger balance sheet in the event of a downturn later. Or, three, they could have put it in their pocket. And that is what they did. Fifteen months after they stuck a gun to the head of the American economy, they went back to their old ways and made a ton of money. They are very good at what they do. But what they do is not good for America, it is not good for building an economy and sustainable jobs, and they are going to rake that in.

So we have legislation, many of us are on it, that would say to Wall Street: look, if you are not going to lend that money out, we are going to tax those bonuses. Anything above \$50,000, we are going to tax at 50 percent, and we are going to put it into lending for small businesses.

Second, we can create 600,000 to 850,000 jobs by engaging in energy home retrofit programs. In every single community, we have got carpenters, plumbers, masons, electricians out of work because we have got a stagnant home industry. But we have got homeowners who need to save money and need a little help doing it.

If we put \$20 billion into that, we can create 600,000 to 850,000 jobs, all local. We can use materials that have to be made in the United States. Ninety percent of all the retrofit materials are manufactured right here. We can save \$3.3 billion for homeowners by lowering their energy bills. And we can take 3 million cars, the equivalent of 3 million cars, off the road. These are the things we can do, get lending going, and get jobs created. Thank you.

Mr. PERRIELLO. One thing I just want to add on that before I move to the gentleman from Colorado is to say anyone who has run a business or a household knows the difference between an expenditure and an investment. Going out to the movies is different than investing in a solar panel or retrofitting your home.

Now is the time where we need to be investing. We can do that through

some of the retrofitting of both our commercial and residential stock. We can do that by investing in our workforce development and by getting that lending, again, to small and medium-size business.

There has been a thought among some of the elites in this country that we can continue to prosper without building anything, without growing anything. At some point, we have to be creating value in the system. Our financial sector is extremely important, and it will be strong if there are good rules in place that allow for predictability.

But we also must remember the industrial and agricultural sectors. These are not things of a bygone past, though sometimes in this city and on Wall Street that is forgotten. These remain major drivers of economic growth, major drivers of employment; and we must have an economic development strategy in addition to a financial sector strategy.

Some of the things that continue to change and set us back, I believe the gentleman from Colorado wants to address, are not just in this building but perhaps across the street. With that, I yield.

Mr. POLIS. I thank the gentleman from Virginia.

Following on the gentleman from Vermont, as well as the gentleman from Ohio, taking us back to where we were before I was in this body, my colleague from Vermont was here, when President Bush, Secretary Paulson said we need a blank check for a whole lot of money, \$700 billion.

Well, what are you going to do with it? Well, we are going to buy toxic assets. We are going to take some of the bad debt off the books of banks and we are going to then relieve them of that, and that will improve their balance sheets, and they will be able to loan again. Well, okay.

At that point the Congress said, well, not one dollar of that TARP money has gone to buying bad debt. Instead, the Bush administration started nationalizing companies left and right. They bought up banks. They are now owned by the government. They bought up automobile companies now owned by the government. They bought insurance companies. They went on a shopping spree and nationalized the means of production in this country.

Now we are at a place where you have Big Government in league with Big Business, the worst of both worlds for the people of this country. This is made worse by a recent Supreme Court decision that opened the channels for unregulated use of corporate funds to influence political elections. That is right. Congress, in its wisdom, had previously established regulations around this that they advertised, they could say call so and so to lobby them but not vote for, vote against, not within 30 days of an election. The Supreme Court threw that all out.

What you now have is a very, very dangerous situation where, let's say

that the Bush administration nationalized a big bank, and let's say there was a Member of Congress didn't think they should. Well, now you have that bank can spend an enormous amount of money trying to stop the reelection of people they don't like and trying to elect people they like. You have Big Government and Big Business working together in the Bush socialist economy to the detriment of the American people.

We will be looking at solutions of campaign finance reform in Congress. A lot of it needs to start with that, for Congress to take action and be willing to take on this nexus where Big Business and Big Government operated in unholy alliance. We need to make sure that the system is influenced by the people of the country, rather than the corporations with their dollars, using them to confuse and trick people with their massive and misleading public relations attacks. I am hopeful.

I am a sponsor of the fair elections bill, a campaign finance reform bill; many of my colleagues are as well. We also need to look at disclosure requirements, shareholder approval requirements. We need to make it more difficult, not easier, for corporations to influence the United States Congress.

I yield back to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. PERRIELLO. I thank you for those comments. We can't say enough about how disastrous this decision is, not just for the political system in terms of corruption of the political system, but really a threat to the private sector itself, when the biggest corporations are able to capture government, as we have seen in the years past.

What they do is they try to lock in the status quo that is the very antithesis of capitalism, which is about innovation and competition. When you are able to buy the referees on the field, you no longer have a decent game. We will outcompete and win on that fair battlefield, on that fair sports field, but you cannot do it when they are buying the referees. And anyone who thinks that money has no influence in politics may need to have a little wake-up call.

This is a disastrous decision that goes against decades of precedent. Many out there who decry judicial activism, this is not only overthrowing decades of precedent but a decision just 6 years earlier that had come down the opposite way which looks dangerous in terms of what it means for our Supreme Court. But, again, I think you do a good job of pointing out exactly what it means for the private sector.

I will go to the gentleman from New York and then the gentleman from California.

Mr. TONKO. Thank you, Representative PERRIELLO, for bringing us together this evening for conversation and dialogue on what is an important part of the work we are doing right now. There can be no more important issue than jobs, job creation, job reten-

tion, and dealing with the Nation's economy.

I am glad that we are talking about a bit of a reality check this evening, too, to review history, what brought us here.

There is no mistaking that this administration and we in Congress this year have inherited, as freshmen, a very difficult task because some irresponsible behavior guided the decision-making; and where we found that we grew a deficit to record proportions, historically largest deficit, handed to this administration. That was just a year ago.

So when we look at some of the stats that the stimulus package was responsible for, minimally, 2 million jobs, looking at a number of projections and assessments that have been done out there, I think it is reassuring to know that we have been able to speak to that gross number of at least, minimally, 2 million jobs that came about through sound stewardship and through investment at a time when our recession was bleeding this economy. And all telltale indicators suggest that that bleeding has stopped. But we have only placed a down payment upon the economy with the stimulus package.

In the pipeline are tremendous investments to come, areas that deal with communications, with broadband, opportunities for our neighborhoods, for our communities dealing with transportation projects that are coming, with the smart grid, investment in smart meters, and all of the delivery system that brings the energy supplies to our doorstep, be it a workplace or a home place.

So these are sound investments, so much so that the news we received just recently last month about the third quarter showed 2.2 percent growth. That came about because of a change in thinking, a change of behavior. As witnessed over the last several months and years, we were dealing with what was a draining situation. In fact, I have to look at the fact that we provided within the stimulus package a middle class tax cut, largest in its nature, in its history. And what benefited our communities was that 95 percent of working families in this country realized the benefit that amounted to some \$37 billion in tax relief that came through their paychecks during the calendar year of 2009. That was important work. That was a way to help stretch the budgets for our American households.

Contrast that with the fact that tax cuts under the Bush administration were provided by borrowing from China. Now, isn't it interesting that China was made strong with our kind of irresponsible behavior. We look now at the fact that China's clean energy budget surpasses her defense budget. And we, in this Nation, have an opportunity to enter into that clean energy global race in a sound and practical manner, to prepare ourselves and to invest in the American economy and in

the American race in that global measure that will find us a leader, an innovator, one that will become the ultimate go-to nation for energy intellect. And that is the juncture we find ourselves in today.

Representative PERRIELLO, I would suggest that this clean energy economy that we try to create, and Representative WELCH touched upon it just a moment ago, there is an awful lot of opportunity for us to invest.

The banking community has shied away from energy efficiency, from some of the retrofits we can do for businesses and residents. We know that in this economy it is much easier for them to grant a 20-year plan for a coal plant or a 30-year plan for a nuclear plant, but we can't get the investment in energy efficiency seen as our fuel of choice.

It has been stated that we are writing annually about a \$900 billion check to our competitors simply because of our energy, our gluttonous energy behavior and the price tag on our energy bills. If we could move forward and provide for ESCOs, energy service companies, to go out into this company and retrofit our residential parcels and allow for us to reduce that demand that is worldwide gluttonous in nature, if we could invest in the infrastructure, the human infrastructure, the workforce, it is said that for every billion dollars of investment in retrofitting our residential parcels, some 8,000 jobs are created. That is how we bring back this economy. And it has been happening.

We have been doing installments. We have been great stewards of that stimulus package. We have made certain they go to vital projects. I can see it happening. I can see the pipeline activities coming in the next few months with high-speed rail, with communications opportunities. I think we are on the right course. We need to invest heavily now in a green energy, clean energy economy. That is our way in one sector of activity that can really produce a multitude of wins, with reducing energy demand, enhancing job creation, and reducing the carbon footprint of this Nation and the globe.

Mr. PERRIELLO. What the gentleman talks about here is so important. We have to have the courage at this moment not just to think about how we survive the next quarter, but how do we thrive in the next quarter of a century. How do we compete again. And spending \$1 billion every day on oil that goes overseas to some of the countries that hate us the most is one of the dumbest strategies imaginable, \$1 billion every day out of this country.

Let me brag on Southside, Virginia for a moment before I go on, because we are at the cutting edge of the new energy economy. Just last week, we worked with one of the biggest dairy farmers in the State, and we are going to turn cow manure into power. So instead of having all the effluence go off into the Chesapeake Bay and annoy

neighbors with the smell and be a costly thing that makes milk more expensive, we are going to invest in an anaerobic digester that is going to turn that into power, not only fuel the entire farm, but also much of the town around it.

□ 2030

I say to farmers who say, How are my kids going to make it with the utility bills that these monopoly utilities are jacking up on us—a 93 percent increase in my area in the last 5 years—I'd say, I don't want you to have a power bill at all. In 5 years, I hope you're selling power in the same way that you're selling milk today.

We have a truck stop owner in my district who's figured out a way. After 9/11, he said, You know, I'm nothing but a front man for al Qaeda. I'm selling their product. Instead, I want to sell an American product. He's worked with farmers in our area to use canola oil to sell a premium diesel fuel—a premium fuel, not a low-grade fuel—and instead of 3 cents on every dollar staying in the county, which is what happens in a normal truck stop, 93 cents on every dollar is staying in our community supporting farmers, supporting the refining.

One of the poorest communities in Virginia, highest unemployment, we're working in their landfill to capture the methane, turn it into power so we can reduce power bills for low-income residents and make it more attractive to business. This is what other countries are daring to do, and we've always been better at it. We've got to dare to be better at it if we're going to be ahead.

With that, I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Well, the gentleman from Virginia couldn't be more correct. I'm a cattle rancher, so you're getting very close to home with the discussion about methane and cow power. It's a reality. It actually is happening in large parts of California. Keep in mind that methane is a greenhouse gas that's over 20 times more powerful than carbon dioxide, so you're getting a twofer here. You're getting an energy source. And methane actually is very similar in chemistry to natural gas, so it is a very, very important thing. It has all of the win-win that you just talked about and it takes care of a small environmental problem when you do this methane production.

So this is another example of the way in which this Congress last year in the American Recovery Act instituted public policies that are a win-win for America. These are long-term investments. More than a hundred, almost \$200 million of that stimulus money goes into energy research. We're talking about jobs, researchers in laboratories and the university campuses that are figuring out how to do these things in an efficient and an effective way. In California, we have major research underway in laboratories at the universities that are figuring out how

can you use algae to produce fuel. And it's actually happening. Some of that fuel is now being used in jet airplanes, and the Department of Defense is testing the use of that fuel, biofuels of all kinds.

The other thing that's happening here is the notion that energy is a fundamental national security issue. My colleagues, you've already talked about the enormous expense that the energy consumption is bringing to us and the risk that it puts us in when we get the energy from the most dangerous places in the world. Every step we take to conserve and every step we take to use alternate and renewable energy is a step that enhances our national security.

I want us all to keep in mind who was it that voted in the stimulus bill of last year, the American of Recovery Act, for these critical investments. It was our side, the Democratic side, that voted for it. And who voted against it, voted no? It was our colleagues on the other side of the aisle. There is a very clear dichotomy here on philosophy on how to deal with this. Yes, there is a deficit. More than half of that deficit actually occurred during the George W. Bush era in which this Congress was controlled by the other party. I'm being a bit partisan here, but these are the facts.

Now, what was left to us to clean up when President Obama came in? The greatest recession since the Great Depression. The statistics are clear. Look at the job losses, the way they accelerated during the Bush era. And look what happened when Obama and the stimulus package came into place. We saw a reversal of that. We're now building the American economy once again.

One final point, and this was brought up by our colleagues here, and that is the investment in education. This is a long-term investment. Before I took this job, I was a regent at the University of California, and I watched the enormous decline in support to that university. Forty thousand students are not at the State University and the University of California this year. Those are the people that will lead us in the future. They're not there. They will not be available to us. The stimulus package also put a lot of money into the education system and kept the schools open, kept the teachers working.

Thank you so very, very much. I yield my time.

Mr. PERRIELLO. Thank you.

And before I go to the gentleman from Ohio, I think it is important to note how serious fiscal responsibility is and how serious it is for those of us, frankly, who are some of the younger Members of this body who understand that this threat of fiscal irresponsibility is not coming due for our children or our grandchildren. It's not that far off. It's going to be within our lifetime that we see this. And in order to fix a problem, sometimes you have to understand the root cause of that problem.

With that, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. DRIEHAUS. I want to thank the gentleman from Virginia.

Madam Speaker, I think it's important to look back and to determine where this deficit started. And when you look back, it's back in the Clinton administration when we began to turn around the budget here in the United States, where we began to go from deficits to surpluses and we were actually paying down on the debt.

At the beginning of the Bush administration, they had a choice. They had a choice: Should we continue paying off that debt, should we continue paying down the debt in order to support future generations, or, do we want to gain short-term political gain? I think Republicans in Congress and the Bush administration chose that short-term political gain, because we know what they did. They decided to pursue tax cuts for the wealthiest Americans, we engaged in two different wars that were not paid for, and we engaged in reckless spending. And that led to what? The greatest deficits that we have ever seen in the United States.

When we came in the numbers were off the charts, literally off the charts. Americans had never seen deficits like this. They could have chosen a different course. They could have said it's not the fiscally responsible thing to do right now, to pursue these massive tax cuts for the wealthy. They could have said if we're going to engage in war, we're actually going to pay for it as we go. But they decided not to, and they engaged in reckless spending.

So where has that left us? It required us to make an investment and to continue to spend in order to end this recession, because if we didn't make expenditures in the stimulus, the recession would have gone longer and the recession would have been deeper. I already mentioned that this was the longest recession that we have experienced since the Great Depression. It would have been significantly longer were it not for the stimulus. We know this to be true.

I gave an example earlier of the Realtors. Just this weekend, the Realtors and homebuilders were praising the tax credits in the stimulus for finally getting first-time home buyers back into the market. But we spent a lot of time here tonight talking about new energy technology and how we're going to build this economy in the future, and it is through investment in energy and manufacturing and clean technologies that we're going to move forward.

Just today, Ted Strickland, the Governor of the State of Ohio, gave his State of the State address. In that, the Governor said, I believe in Ohio because Ohio will power the future.

So I want to challenge the gentleman from Virginia, because Ohio is poised. Ohio is poised to lead this Nation in manufacturing, in clean energy technology.

And I'll just give you one more story because it's a good one. Several months

ago, I went out to a business in my district called XTech. Now this was a business that was really reliant upon the steel industry. They make steel rollers for the steel industry. They're made from steel. They sell to the steel industry. I went there thinking, Wow, they're not going to particularly like the investments that we're making in the stimulus in new energy technology. They're not going to like the direction that we're heading in terms of greenhouse gasses. Instead, when I walked in, they said, Thanks. Thanks for your support and thanks for the Congress. Because we get it. You get it. They realized that they were one of the few manufacturers in all of the United States that has the ability to make the steel gears for windmills, windmills that are being built and going up across the country.

Now, we could allow European countries to build these parts. We could allow European countries to sell into the United States. But because of the investments we're making in new energy technology, because of the investments this Congress is making to get us out of this recession, businesses like XTech see a future where there was no future before. That's what the stimulus has meant. Has it required additional spending? Yes. But that additional spending has allowed us to reduce the size of the recession, the duration of the recession, and put Americans back to work.

With that, I yield back.

Mr. PERRIELLO. I will take the challenge from the gentleman from Ohio and remind him of the recent NCAA soccer championship in which I believe the University of Virginia beat a team from your State, a very good team from your State.

Mr. DRIEHAUS. It was a good team.

Mr. PERRIELLO. I do just want you to be warned that that challenge may not work out well for your State. I think what we're talking about here is this issue: We cannot speculate our way to economic recovery.

Sometimes when I'm meeting with the folks in my district—just a couple of days ago I was down in a town that has seen several plants close. The big plants closed back in the nineties after NAFTA. A recent set have closed that had managed to cling on a lot longer. They turned to me and said, Do people up there know we exist, those of us that are making 15, 20, 25 bucks an hour? Do they know we're out there?

And they know that I'm fighting through the Jobs Caucus, through the jobs bill, by being a broken record about jobs, jobs, jobs. But there's a sense that sometimes those on Wall Street and, as Mr. POE mentioned, that Wall Street-Washington collusion, only think about the folks that are already doing really well in the economy and forget about that working middle class, forget about advanced manufacturing, forget about the next generation of farming and ag products and forestry, forget about the fact that two-thirds of

job growth in this country comes from small and medium-sized businesses. They may not get the same headlines as the Goldman Sachs, but they employ America. They treat their workers well. They're accountable, and they produce real value in our community. Those are the folks we have to remember. Those are the people that are taking it on the chin from getting nickel-and-dimed by credit card companies and bank fees and utility rate increases and everything across the board. Those working- and middle-class folks need a voice. We need to be that voice.

I've given the President a little grief tonight and certainly his Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Geithner, for not being the change that I expected to see and not doing enough for Main Street, but when the President last came here, he did say something that's so important for us to remember. He was talking about how big the challenges are that we face, whether it's health reform or energy independence or the great recession. And he said, We're going to step up and face this because that's what Americans do. We don't back down. We don't back away from a challenge.

Every generation of Americans are faced with a challenge. Some have to storm the beaches of Normandy, some have had to fight great wars. We are being asked to figure out how to compete again in the 21st century and have a strong middle class. And part of that is being willing to do the tough decisions on energy independence and other areas that are going to be the job creators. When we worry about something like the Supreme Court decision saying that if corporations can spend unlimited money, that means the corporations that are competitive today will be able to lock in their monopolies through the Washington-Wall Street collusion. What we have to have is the innovation, even the creative destruction, to create the jobs and the competitive advantage of the future.

The President asked us to have that courage that every generation of Americans has, to not back down from the challenge. This is our challenge, whether it's how to get the budget balanced, how to shore up the middle class, how to be economically competitive in a global economy, how to create competitiveness in energy and health care and other sectors. This is our time, and we will step up and we will try to be worthy of the American people. We will not forget those working- and middle-class folks.

With that, I yield the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TONKO. Thank you, Representative PERRIELLO. Thank you again for bringing us together this evening.

The gentleman from Ohio charted for us the recession, and to use his phrase, it went off the charts, literally. I think what is important to recognize is that we stopped the bleeding. We stopped that drop off the charts with this stimulus package. And the experts, econo-

mists are suggesting that perhaps it would have been another one or two points higher, percentage-wise, the unemployment rate.

□ 2100

Well, that translates into millions of people, millions of people who would have lost a job had it not been for this stimulus and stopping the bleeding. So I think this investment is wise. And it also tells us—we've heard here this evening—that we're investing in a way that allows America's business community and the manufacturing base to do it smarter. We give them the tools to do it smarter. I believe that that's how we sharpen the competitive edge for our business community. They compete in the global marketplace. If we give them a smarter outcome, we will be victorious at that global marketplace. We may not even do it cheaper, but we'll do it smarter. And that will be a thumbs up for the American worker.

So this evening, it was a pleasure to join with you to talk about what we can do with the clean energy economy, what we are doing with the stimulus, the investment in the future of this country in a way that uses cutting-edge tools, which is the important strategy here. And I am proud of the opportunities to be able to think outside the barrel when it comes to energy policy so that we can lift this Nation to a new era of accomplishment and competitiveness. It starts with the stimulus, and it will continue with legislation on jobs, job reform, health care reform, and certainly with energy independence. We need to multitask. Every American worker I know multitasks. We, here in this Chamber, need to multitask and get a host of legislative pieces done. These bills are essential to the rise of the American worker.

Mr. DRIEHAUS. I thank the gentleman from New York. Picking up on the point about multitasking and getting a host of things done. We haven't talked much tonight, and I think it's important. I have the honor of serving on the Financial Services Committee, and I think one of the most important things that we have done for the American people since we have been here is to make sure that we don't go back from where we came. And that is, we don't re-create what created this recession in the first place.

Recently we passed regulatory reform here in the House. The Senate now has that bill in front of them, in front of Senator DODD's committee, and I hope they take it up. And I hope they take it up in short order because what we were able to do in the House version of regulatory reform was to say, you know, these mortgage-backed securities, these credit default swaps, these crazy derivative products that no one was paying any attention to, that the Republicans in Congress said we didn't need to regulate but we know led to the great recession, what we did for the first time, we actually addressed it.

And we said, We're not going to allow the systemic risk in the system any longer. We're going to protect the American people because it's the folks in our neighborhoods, it's the folks in our communities that we represent that continue to pay the price.

So while the Wall Street barons are doling out bonuses left and right on Wall Street, the folks back in my neighborhood are still dealing with the foreclosure crisis. We still have hundreds, if not thousands, of homes in Cincinnati that have been foreclosed on. It's the neighborhoods that are paying the price. I haven't seen the investment banks step up and say that they're creating a community fund for communities across the United States to help alleviate some of the damage that was caused. Instead, they're patting themselves on the back. They're doling out bonuses.

Well, the school systems in our urban core, the small businesses in our urban core, the neighborhoods themselves and families still continue to struggle. They continue to struggle because of the unregulated activity of Wall Street. So we stepped up, and we took responsibility. We passed regulatory reform, and we're going to hold them accountable so that this doesn't happen again in the future.

With that, I'll pass it back to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. PERRIELLO. Well, it is interesting that you mention the importance of this because really, again, what we're doing is voting referees back on the field. We shouldn't be choosing sides as a government, but we should make sure the rules are there. Now no one ever leaves the ball game and says, Wow, I really liked the referees in that game. No one ever says, Oh, the referees did a good job. You notice the referees when things go wrong and when a bad call is made. Government certainly makes errors. But what is important is that we have referees on the field.

I talk to friends of mine all the time who are investors and business leaders, and they say, We want predictability and accountability in the market so we can then adjust to that. It's frustrating not just, I think, for many working and middle class folks who have been asked to pay for the mistakes that were made on Wall Street, in part because of mistakes that were made in Washington, to ask hardworking people in my district making \$30,000 a year to pay for people that were making millions every year. But it has also been frustrating for some investors to say, Look, I made the smart investment. I didn't go for the crazy, exotic mortgage-backed securities and derivatives. I made smart, reasonable hedged risks, and it was fine. Yet the people who did make those high-risk, high-return investments not only got to see the upsid- es in the good years but then got bailed out in the bad years. I mean, if you go to Vegas, and you bet 13 on the roulette wheel, it's a sucker's bet. But

if you know that every time you lose on 13, someone is going to make you money to make the next bet, and when you win, you're going to get to keep it all, of course you are going to keep betting on 13.

So with this, we must understand that the rules must be clear on the field. That's what this is. It's not about being anti-Wall Street. It's about being pro-accountability and having rules that are there. So let's get down to some brass tacks on Main Street job creation, that moves us from speculation on Wall Street to job creation on Main Street, and these are some good, commonsense ideas that should be able to be pursued on a bipartisan basis. We need to figure out a way to get lending going to small- and medium-sized business. If we need to do it through incentives, we can do it through incentives. If we need to do direct lending because the banks just won't do it, we need to do that.

We need to get creative. That is what I hear in my district. People want to expand. They want to hire. They can't get the lending. Consider a capital gains freeze for 2 years for small business. Infrastructure investment, particularly smart grid technology, water infrastructure, broadband infrastructure that we know creates competitive advantage. We've talked about retrofits that already make win-win sense in the economy. We can do this in the commercial sector, the industrial sector. Not at the scale of 100 homes here and 100 homes there. The market incentives are there to do this more broadly than that and put hundreds and hundreds of thousands of people to work in retrofits.

These are concrete areas that will not only help us in these dramatic downturns in our economy, but do it in a way that creates value on the upside because we know that the cheapest electricity is the electricity you never have to buy in the first place. These are ways to invest in our competitiveness. And with that, I yield to another member of our class.

Mrs. DAHLKEMPER. Thank you very much. I appreciate the gentleman from Virginia bringing us together tonight. I just wanted to come and join you in the sentiments that you have expressed.

As we look at our country and look where we have been and how we got to where we are not just today but in the 200-plus years, it's our ingenuity, it's our resourcefulness, and it's our strong work ethic that really has always propelled the United States to success. Our prosperity, as we know, is built on the American dream and the belief that we can achieve extraordinary things in the future, regardless of all the challenges of the present. And this is the vision of Main Street Americans. Work hard, set high goals, and be optimistic about the future.

In the face of this economic crisis, it's all too easy I think to choose cynicism, but I think if we abandon the op-

timism, and the American dream, we'll do nothing but delay our return to prosperity. I have certainly seen small businesses on my Main Streets throughout my district who have really taken these difficult times and really made changes in their business, and we need to be here in Washington supporting those businesses.

I have had people like John Hall, who lost his job in the textile industry, but then that didn't deter him from a new path to success. In fact, he invented a new piece of fishing equipment. With the help of Penn State Behrend and the Northwest Pennsylvania Industrial Resource Center, he has brought his invention to the marketplace. In Butler County, BeamOne, a company which produces electric beam medical sterilization equipment, has announced plans to build a service center in a local industrial park that is going to create at least 20 new jobs.

I find great hope in all of these success stories around my district, and it kind of ties into what everyone's been saying. We cannot listen to the skeptics. The proof is back with the Americans, the Americans on Main Street. They have not lost their optimism. Many of them drive to really define our Nation's character.

It was mentioned earlier on that our decisions need not be about next week, next month or even next year, or even the election this year. The decisions that we make have to be about our future, the future for our children, the future for our grandchildren. We need to invest in that future, and I think we were doing that last year. We are going to continue to do that this year. It's the innovation that's going to take us to the future to make things I think more positive. We've got to be here in Washington, helping them along with that investment. Innovation, innovation, innovation which will lead to jobs, jobs, jobs. So I thank the gentleman.

Mr. DRIEHAUS. I want to thank the gentlelady from Pennsylvania for her comments. And I think tomorrow we're going to hear from the President, and the President is going to challenge us. Because while we know we've seen a 60 percent increase in the stock market over the last year, we also know that we're not to the point yet where we're creating jobs. I think all of us are very worried that while we are entering into a recovery, we're fearful that it's going to be a jobless recovery. We need to focus on creating jobs.

The President is going to challenge us tomorrow night to control spending while at the same time making strategic investments in jobs and job growth across the United States. That's what we're trying to do in infrastructure. That's what we're doing in clean-energy technology. That's what we're doing through our access to education, higher education, in the bills that we've passed earlier in the year. That's the challenge before us.

I think the American people are really sick and tired, quite frankly, of seeing Democrats and Republicans fight against each other because they feel that they are the ones that pay the price for that, and I think they're right. We need to come together. We need to come together, accept the President's challenge, and move forward to create jobs in the United States. So with that, I'll hand it back to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. PERRIELLO. We stand here in the midst of a tremendous economic crisis. What we hear when we go home every weekend is the pain of people who have lost their jobs, the fear of those who think they might be next, the confusion and frustration of having seen one administration seem to wreck the economy and the next not doing enough to fix it.

Well, like many Americans, I am not satisfied. We can sit here tonight and blame the other side for letting the deficit go off the rails or helping to wreck the economy. I am not satisfied being judged by what the other side did. I want us to be judged by whether we get this economy back on track. I want us to be judged by whether we have stepped up to the generational challenges that both parties have failed to address in the decades past.

It's too easy in this town to focus on winning a debate or a legislative fight or a campaign by convincing people that the other side is even worse. That's not a politics worthy of the American people. We've done a lot to stop the bleeding in the economy in the last year, but I'm not satisfied with us merely stopping the bleeding. We must have the healing and the rehabilitation, not just to get us back to where we were, but to an even stronger working and middle class that we've seen in the last few years, a more competitive American economy. A politics that doesn't just reward and lock in the status quo through corporate campaign contributions and ads, but rewards innovation and dares to think of what the next big thing can be, that can unleash again the American competitiveness that is being choked out by so much of the Washington-Wall Street collusion that seems to reward what has been, instead of what needs to be in this country.

It's good to see that Wall Street has recovered and is above 10,000, but I am not satisfied until we see that growth on Main Street, we see the job creation, we see jobs that are somewhere between \$6 an hour and six figures for that vibrant middle class that's always been at the heart of this country. I'm a big believer in this President, and I am a big believer in hope, but hope doesn't pay the mortgage. We have to deal with the banking crisis, the housing crisis. We have to look at the construction sector, education, and workforce development. I am not satisfied with solutions that simply stabilize where we are or offer something a little bit better than what came before. We promised something better than that.

I believe tomorrow night the President has an opportunity to give an address to this Nation that gives an honest reading of the state of this Union, both its unbelievable strengths, its unprecedented hunger for innovation, but also the reality of its economic suffering, particularly with our middle class and working class families who continue to suffer under monopolies of electric utilities, of the credit card companies, of the joblessness; that we will see a President who steps up and continues to say, We are not going to shirk away from the challenges of our time because that's not what Americans do. We step up. We figure out a way to innovate, to out-compete, and to give the American people a kind of politics that they deserve.

That's what brought many of us into politics for the first time, like many of the freshmen who have been speaking tonight. And we are not satisfied yet with the change, but we still believe it is possible. We are looking for everyone to come together, Congress and White House, Republican and Democrat, and all the American people throughout this country, to dare to believe that that hunger we have for change and for hope can translate into real results, including a reinvention of America's competitive advantage that helps restore the strength of that middle class, that understands that two-thirds of our job growth comes from small- and medium-sized business, that gets lending going again, that gets job creation going again and moves us from rewarding speculation on Wall Street to job creation on Main Street.

I thank my colleagues tonight for joining with us on the eve of the State of the Union address.

□ 2115

GOVERNMENT SPENDING

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SCHAUER). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, Thomas Jefferson once wrote, To preserve the independence of the people we must not let our rulers load us with perpetual debt. We must make our election between economy and liberty or profusion and servitude.

Unfortunately, it increasingly appears this Congress has chosen the latter path of profuse spending and the servitude to Big Government that results therefrom. For the next 60 minutes, I and my colleagues are going to talk about the problem our country faces from a very different perspective than you have heard during the last 60 minutes.

I want to start by pointing out the nature of this problem in terms of government spending. This chart shows the deficit each year, starting in 2000. In 2000 and 2001 under a Republican

Congress and first a Democratic President and a Republican President we had a balanced budget and therefore we generated surpluses and, in fact, the two previous years before that we generated a total of \$500 billion in surpluses that were paid down against the national debt.

Then came the recession and September 11, 2001, and spending increases. Many have, I think fairly, criticized the previous President and Congress for spending too much money during this period of time when deficits rose as high as \$400 billion. In fact, this deficit in 2004 was the highest deficit in American history until we got to the very end of the Republican majority, when it went to \$450 billion. Staggering sums of money; too much money spent.

But look what happened when the Democrats took the majority in the Congress in 2007. It skyrocketed to deficits that last year and this year are over \$1 trillion: last year, \$1.4 trillion; this year projected to be close to \$1.5 trillion. To give you an idea how much money we're talking about, this year's budget is projected to spend about \$3.6 trillion with revenues coming in of \$2.2 trillion. So we're going to spend 50 percent more than we take in in revenues. And what are we going to do? We're going to borrow every penny of that money against our children and grandchildren's future.

Now, if this were going to resolve the problem, and some have argued on the other side of the aisle that the so-called stimulus, which contributed almost all of this deficit in this Congress, if they were going to argue that that was going to solve the problem and we would get back to balanced budgets and we wouldn't be borrowing against our children and grandchildren's future for as far as the eye could see, I would listen to their argument. I still wouldn't agree with them.

But their own budget belies what they claim about what they're doing with this so-called economic stimulus package because this is the projected budget for each year until 2019. For the next 9 years, it never goes below \$700 billion and is around \$800 billion, ending at close to 900, over \$900 billion in 2019. Never does it go down, never does it even approach these numbers, which I and my colleagues who will speak with you tonight, all agree were excessive.

But they're nothing compared to what is being done right now, since the Democratic Party became the majority party in this Congress, and Speaker PELOSI has pushed these budget deficits that are absolutely staggering. What does it mean? It means that in 1990, the total national debt, the accumulation of those deficits was \$2.86 trillion. And in 2007, when the Democratic majority took over, it was \$8.45 trillion. In just two more years, it's now \$12.18 trillion, rising by the end of the term of our current President, 6 years into the Democrats' control of the Congress, to \$16.36 trillion, nearly doubling, and

then continuing at that upward arc even more dramatically after that.

This is the public debt outlook. This is the projection that says what the outlook was first in January of 2009 and then, after the stimulus had taken effect, after they had begun spending nearly \$1 trillion that was allegedly going to stimulate the economy and create jobs for the American people, they came back and revisited it in August.

And while they were projecting this gradual but still very serious increase, it skyrocketed instead. Why? Because they have done nothing to control spending. They have done exactly the opposite. So now the President is going to come to the Congress tomorrow night and, as the President of the United States, we are all anxious to hear what he has to say about what we should be doing to address the problems of our country. And we are told by those who are in the know that the President will call for a spending freeze for 3 years. But what is he doing with the spending freeze but locking in those higher spending increases that have been passed through all the appropriations bills this year, some with 12, 14, 16 percent increases over the previous year, locking in those higher levels of spending when we all know that what really has to take place is to cut government spending.

What has been the effect of the President's efforts? Well, this is a chart showing job losses since the stimulus took effect in March of last year: 2.74 million more jobs have been lost in this country over the ensuing 10 months, notwithstanding the claim that this would create jobs and would halt the unemployment rate at 8 percent. Instead, it is now over 10 percent, and we've lost 2.74 million more jobs.

Well, what is the solution to this? A big part of it is something that 49 out of our 50 State governments have got to do, and the Congress should be required to do as well, and that is to balance the budget each year except in times of war or national emergency. In the last 40 years, those 4 years, in the late 1990s and into the early 2000s were the only 4 years in which the Federal Government balanced its budget. The other 36 years they ran a deficit. And you can see how that deficit is adding and mounting each year now, adding to that national debt. It should be the reverse.

In the last 40 years there have been economic crises like the one that we are in now, and there have been times of war when we might not balance that budget. But instead of four times out of 40 balancing it, it should be four times out of 40 not balancing the budget.

And that is why we need a balanced budget amendment in the United States Constitution; 49 out of 50 States have it. This Congress came very close to passing it as a part of the Contract with America in 1995. It passed the House of Representatives with a strong bipartisan majority, and was sent over

to the United States Senate, and it failed in the Senate by one vote to get the two-thirds majority. It requires a two-thirds majority in the House, a two-thirds majority in the Senate, and then three-quarters of our State legislatures to ratify it.

Well, we got all but one vote that we needed in the Senate. Had that vote been provided to give us two-thirds, it would have been sent to the States. The President does not have any say in an amendment to the Constitution. So it would have been sent directly to the States. And I believe by now three-quarters of those States long ago would have ratified that balanced budget amendment, and we would be in a much different situation in this country today if we had done that.

Well, the American people have never abandoned this idea, even though the Democratic Congress long ago abandoned this idea, and that's unfortunate. But the American people, poll after poll shows that 75, 80 percent or more of the American people believe that the Federal Government should be required to balance its budget each and every year, except in times of war or economic emergency. And this would require a supermajority vote of the Congress to declare that they would not balance the budget in any particular year.

How popular is this? Well, here's what our current majority leader had to say about a balanced budget when we had that debate in 1995: the issue of balancing the budget is not a conservative or a liberal one, nor is it an easy one, but it is an essential one for us in this House, for the American people, and, most assuredly, for future generations.

Representative STENY HOYER, a member of the minority in 1995, voted for a balanced budget amendment; but we have not heard about a balanced budget amendment from this majority in this Congress at all. And we're here tonight to urge the Congress to bring up the balanced budget amendment that I introduced on the first day of this Congress, House Joint Resolution 1, a balanced budget amendment to the United States Constitution. And we will keep pushing for this until we have leadership in this Congress that will bring this bill to the floor for a vote so we can send it to the Senate again and challenge them again to provide those two-thirds votes needed and then send it to the States for ratification.

It is never too late for the Congress to do the responsible thing. But we have dug a much, much deeper hole as a result of the irresponsible budgets that have been passed by this Democratic majority in each of the last three Congresses and projected, as I pointed out, projected for the next decade, huge deficits as far as the eye can see, far greater than anything we have seen previously in the history of our country.

I'm joined by several of our colleagues, and I want to recognize the

gentleman from Colorado (Mr. COFFMAN), who has been a real leader on this issue and has been working to organize support in the Congress for the balanced budget amendment to the Constitution. I'm pleased to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado. I thank the gentleman from Virginia for all your work as the prime sponsor of that resolution for a balanced budget amendment and certainly want to work with you to do everything I can to get that passed. You know, when we look at, I think as you mentioned, discretionary spending, nondefense discretionary spending now stands, I think, about \$536 billion, up nearly 24 percent since the Bush Administration's last full budget in fiscal year 2008, which was \$433.6 billion.

So we have a \$1.4 trillion deficit right now. And the President is expected to address a joint session of Congress tomorrow night, and I think he's going to present two plans, from what I understand, to bring down the deficit. The first is he's going to freeze one-sixth of the budget that will be domestic discretionary nondefense spending, but only one-sixth of the budget; and over 10 years, the estimated savings, should that section of the budget not be allowed to increase, would be about—is estimated to be, by the administration, \$250 billion. But when we look at the extraordinary increases that this administration's done, I think we're looking at nondefense discretionary spending went up 10.3 percent in fiscal year 2009, 12.3 percent as projected this year, when inflation is at an all-time low.

And I think that the other program that I believe that he's going to be presenting to the Congress is some sort of a Presidential bipartisan commission, controlled by his party, to lower the deficit. And first of all, I think if we look at the first plan, it's far too low. He needs to get spending down to where it was before he certainly got in office. But the second one, I think, is just going to be cover for a tax increase to have some kind of bipartisan increase for a tax increase without really reducing spending.

And I really want to rise in support of what I think the most important thing is that the United States can do, and that is the balanced budget amendment. And having been a former State legislator from one of those 49 States that requires a balanced budget, you have to make the hard decisions. And you rise in debate where you're debating tradeoffs, where you can't have everything, where you can't simply run a deficit for your operating budget. You can certainly go to the people or float bonds for certain capital improvement projects like roads and bridges and things like that, but you cannot simply increase spending that is out of balance with revenues that are coming in, unlike the Federal Government.

□ 2130

This is my first year in the Congress, and I see that as the most significant

problem facing the Congress, that you're in a situation where there are no tradeoffs, that an administration can come in and really try and have it all in terms of spending and put it at such an extraordinary burden, not simply on the economy in terms of inflation and high interest rates that could choke off this recovery, but to put a crushing debt on future generations yet unborn I think is extraordinarily unconscionable.

So with that, I rise in support with the gentleman from Virginia and look forward to working with you on what I think is absolutely the most critical thing. If there is one thing that we can do in the Congress of the United States to save this country from financial ruin—and without a strong economy we cannot have a strong defense to protect our national security interests—a balanced budget is the most critical thing that we can do for the future of this country in this Congress.

Mr. GOODLATTE. I thank the gentleman. I hope he remains. There may be other things we may want to discuss about this.

But before we get back to him, I'd like to recognize the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CONAWAY) who is a very outspoken Member of Congress on this issue of fiscally responsible budgets and that we balance the budget of our country. And I will yield to the gentleman from Texas, and shortly we will get to the gentleman from Florida who I know wants to say a few words and then needs to leave, but I hope the gentleman from Texas can also remain and we will continue this dialogue.

Mr. CONAWAY. I thank the gentleman from Virginia, and I look forward also to working with you on the balanced budget amendment.

As our colleague from Colorado said, the single most important constitutional amendment that is bandied about these days, and there are several that are important, but there is none more important than a balanced budget. If we only could do one constitutional amendment in the next 10 years, let's do this one.

Think back. I wonder who those 35 Senators were in 1995 who all voted "no" on the balanced budget amendment, if any of them are still in Congress, if we could point to one of them and say, Had you voted "yes" in 1995, then surely during the surplus years we experienced in the late 1990s, it's easy to pass a balanced budget at that point in time because nobody's pig's getting stuck.

We would have avoided trillions and trillions of dollars in debt had one Senator moved over in 1995. It would be interesting to see if any of those 35 who voted "no" are still in the Congress right now and would fess up to having a good slug of this problem.

My colleagues all know that anybody can start a diet tomorrow. The easiest diet is the diet you start tomorrow. Wait until you start a diet today.

The single greatest threat to our way of life is not al Qaeda. It is not the

Islamist jihadists, as bad as they are. They will get some of us, but they will not get all of us. The single biggest threat to our way of life in my view is the growth in this Federal Government as demonstrated by the growth in spending.

If you look at the chart, the more insidious two things about that chart are that, one, the 2010 deficit is estimated to be \$1.4 trillion, which I think is not on that chart yet; two, the out-years, which are the least accurate, the out-years are all increasing. The deficit goes up. They can't even put together a set of numbers and facts that at least give the facade of showing they are going to drop spending in the out-years.

Mr. GOODLATTE. If the gentleman will yield, that is very similar to the fact over the weekend three different representatives of the administration got on television and claimed that the stimulus—which we've seen has not resulted in job creation but, rather, 2¾ million jobs lost—claimed, well, there would have been more jobs lost had we not had the stimulus, but they can come nowhere near agreeing with each other on what those jobs saved are.

I think the only really accurate figure is what is reported by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, which points out that we've lost 2.7 million jobs.

Mr. CONAWAY. Even over the weekend they were saying that yes, we've lost 7 million jobs but we've created X number of million jobs. The real issue is the net job loss, because those are folks that are out of work. That is kind of a hollow thing to brag about.

Another thing about the chart. It assumes that the Bush tax cuts from 2001 and 2003 expire. Hundreds of billions of dollars in new taxes are in those numbers, and those numbers are still as bad as they look and with the trillions of dollars of deficit that are accumulating.

Now, the bad news about this is that we're not going to pay that debt off. I had a fifth grade student in Fredericksburg, Texas. I was doing a town hall meeting for a school that was K-12. A little fellow raised his hand and said, Mr. Congressman, what's the plan to pay off the national debt? And I looked at him. I said, What? This is a technique you use to try to gain time to try to think of what your answer might be. He said, Yes, sir. What's the plan to pay off the national debt? I said, Young man, that's the single best question I've ever been asked. There is no plan to pay off the national debt.

So what we are doing is we're putting a floor under future generations' tax rates, because this cumulative debt, America will constantly pay the interest on this debt from now until eternity. So what we've done to future generations is you're going to have to tax yourselves enough to pay the interest on the debt from now on. That's before you get to start thinking about national security. That's before you get to start thinking about homeland secu-

rity or anything else you might want to do with the world you inherit from us. You're going to have to pay the debt because your parents and grandparents didn't have the fiscal discipline to just say "no."

So I would love to stay around and visit with you this afternoon for some other comments, but I know our colleague from Florida wants to talk as well.

I couldn't agree with my colleague from Virginia any more. This is House Joint Resolution 1. It should be number one in our hearts and number one in the docket for this Congress. It should have been that a year ago in January, and it ought to be tomorrow on the ballot to be talking about because there is nothing more important to our way of life than gaining control of our profligate spending ways.

So I thank the gentleman for having this hour tonight.

Mr. GOODLATTE. I thank the gentleman for his comments about House Joint Resolution Number 1. It is, by the way, the same balanced budget amendment that passed the House as a part of the Contract with America, missed by one vote in the Senate. Same language entirely. And it has over 170 cosponsors in the House right now, including many Democrats. It's bipartisan, and it needs to be bipartisan to get that two-thirds majority of the House to vote for it and pass it and be able to send it on to the Senate.

I would now like to recognize the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BUCHANAN) who has also been a leader on this issue and has, in fact, introduced a balanced budget amendment on his own. And we are proud to work together in promoting fiscal responsibility here in the Congress.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I would like to thank the gentleman from Virginia for his enormous leadership.

As I agree with all of my colleagues, everybody has a different reason why they run for Congress. I have been in business for 30 years. Your first term, my second term. But that was my number one issue by far is these runaway deficits. And since I came in 2006, we've got \$1.4 trillion. We've picked up another \$2 trillion. Another 20 percent we've added to the deficit in the last 3 years. It's crazy.

The numbers today were over \$12 trillion in debt. And with the budget the Democrats have presented in terms of going forward, they're talking about close to \$20 trillion in the next 6, 7, 8 years. If you took the number of 5 percent cost of money on \$20 trillion, it's a trillion dollars a year before you pay \$1 for Social Security, Medicare, or anything. It's unbelievable.

This past year, the deficit was \$1.4 trillion. As bad as it's been in the past, if you look at \$300 billion, \$400 billion is way too much. We should have been balancing those budgets. But \$1.4 trillion, that is three times larger, plus, than any other deficit from that standpoint.

The last 50 years—and what really motivated me is why this has to be a bipartisan effort. In the last 50 years, I think—and you might know exactly the number, but I think it's only been about four or five or six times we balanced the budget. Forty-four times we haven't. We're incapable of balancing this budget, with the exception of getting a constitutional balanced budget amendment.

Forty-nine out of fifty Governors have to balance their budgets. Our city in Sarasota, Florida, or Manatee County, they've got to balance their budgets. Families have to balance their budgets. Businesses can't continue to spend.

I grew up in Detroit down the street from General Motors. If you look at the most powerful, successful corporation in the world, made a lot of commitments to a lot of folks who used to be 30 and out for the blue collar worker. My brother was there when he was 18. Many of them looked at 30 and out. But now they've reneged on all of the benefits and everything else. We've got to stop it. It's crazy, and we've got to bring some common sense to this whole process.

That is why we've got to have a constitutional balanced budget amendment. As my colleague mentioned, we were one vote short in '94, and we've got to go back in that effort. It defies logic why we don't do that.

The other thing, I came here and I want to be the best I can, bipartisan. The Democrats talked about PAYGO. That's a joke. PAYGO, it sounded good. You know, it's better than nothing, I thought. But we ran our largest deficit ever—\$1.4 trillion with PAYGO. You look at now we want to have a commission and talk about that on a bipartisan basis. Again, they won't get it done. I have absolutely no confidence that that is going to get done.

We need a constitutional balanced budget amendment that says if you take in \$3 trillion—that is what we took in my first year in Congress—you don't spend more than that, \$3 trillion. As we said, 49 out of 50 Governors can't spend more than they take in. In the State of Florida, our budget was \$72 trillion a few years ago. It's down to \$62 trillion. They've had to make the adjustments. They've had to find the efficiencies. And we've got to do the same thing here.

I tell people—I think it was roughly a year ago you might remember we had a bill here, Aid to Africa. We were giving them \$15 billion a year. And the thought was in this environment, same environment we're in now, tough year, families are making cuts, businesses are making cuts, you think they might cut it 10 percent or maybe add 2 percent. We're a very generous Nation. They went from \$15 billion to \$50 billion. And I think every Democrat voted for it and half the Republicans.

So my thought was, Okay, here we go. We're going to go borrow the money from China. Taxpayers are

going to pay interest on that for a long time, and our children and grandchildren. And it's going to go to Africa, and God only knows where it goes when it gets to Africa. I thought to myself, Why don't we have China give it to Africa? Why do we have to be the middleman in that process?

But the bottom line is we've got to recommit ourselves. I think what happened on Tuesday a week ago in Massachusetts, spending and runaway spending has got so many people in my district and I think across the country, they realize that we defy common sense up here. That's why they're so angry and mad. There are a lot of other issues, but I think the top of this is they're concerned about what we leave our children and grandchildren.

I was in Bradenton, Florida, at a town hall meeting. A gentleman stood up, 63 years old. He said, Congressman, I have never been to one of these. I don't get involved politically in this. But he said, I have five children and I think 13 grandchildren. It's the first time in my life—I've been a small business man all my life. I am very, very concerned about where we're at and where we're going. I feel like we're heading towards bankruptcy, what I see, what I sense, my business background. He said, We can't continue to keep spending.

And I share that feeling. I know that my colleagues all share that feeling today, and this is the most important issue. It's the reason I came in 2006. I have two children in their mid-twenties. Every generation has left it better for the next generation. I don't want our generation to be the first generation that doesn't do this. And we need to come together in a bipartisan basis and do what's best, in the best interest of not only Americans but America.

Mr. GOODLATTE. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

I'd like to talk a little bit about what those economic consequences are, not just for our children and grandchildren, which should be our greatest concern, but not too far down. And in a moment I will turn to the gentlemen from Texas and Colorado and ask them, to get the benefit of their thoughts about what the consequences are of these deficits running as far as the eye can see if we don't pass a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution and start living within our means like every family, every business, large and small, every local government, and yes, even every State government, some of which are not managed very well. But they have to come to terms with the consequences of their actions a lot more quickly than the Federal Government ever has because of the fact they don't have this requirement to balance the budget, and every year they kick the can down the road. They say, We can have it all, and we'll just borrow more money to pay for it.

Well, I've asked high school students when they have come to see me or

when I've had an opportunity to speak to them in their classes, I said, Who do you think is going to bear the burden of this debt that we're piling up? And they know the answer to that. They know that it's falling on their shoulders, but they don't have an appreciation of how serious it is, how large a debt it is and how dramatically it can affect the future of our country in the long term and also in the not-too-distant future as well.

□ 2145

So I said, let me give you a starting point to think about that. I said, how much is \$1 trillion? The economic stimulus package, \$1 trillion, cha ching. The budget deficit, the \$3.6 trillion spending at the beginning of the year—they projected \$2.4 trillion in revenue, \$1.2 trillion deficit. We now know that we are several months into that year, and lo and behold, it's even greater than \$1.2 trillion. Over \$1 trillion, the health care bill, the monstrosity that brought people out to the polls in Massachusetts last week, \$1.1 trillion, according to the Speaker's budget projections; in the Senate, \$800 billion.

But we all know that when you have a bill that has 10 years worth of taxes to pay for it and only 6 years worth of benefits that you are using smoke and mirrors and it costs way more than \$800 billion over a full 10 years of benefits. Most economists say it will be over \$2 trillion over 10 years to pay for either the House or the Senate health care reform bill.

So how much is \$1 trillion? I said, let me give you a starting point. If you had a stack of \$1,000 bills, nice, freshly printed, tightly packed \$1,000 bills, just 4 inches high, you would have \$1 million. These students were pretty impressed with that. Most of them had never seen a \$1,000 bill, and to think that just 4 inches would be \$1 million. I said, how high would that stack of \$1,000 bills, not \$1 bills, \$1,000 bills, have to be to reach \$1 trillion?

Well, one young lady said, would it be about 12 inches? And a fellow in the back of the room raised his hand. He laughed. He said, oh, no. It would be a lot more than that. It would be about 20 feet. I said, well, think about it this way. One billion is 1,000 times 1 million. And 1 trillion is 1,000 times 1 billion, or 1 million times 1 million. And so that stack of \$1,000 bills that is 4 inches high, to be \$1 million, would have to be 4 million inches high to be \$1 trillion. Four million inches is 63 miles high. It reaches up into outer space. And that's just \$1 trillion.

That's just for the stimulus, or just for the deficit for the coming year, or double that for the new health care bill that they want to add in terms of overall spending that will cost either the taxpayers of this country or borrowed against the future of our country.

When you're talking about trillions of dollars, you're talking about a staggering amount of money. Back in the 1960s, there was a very famous Senator

who was widely quoted as having said, \$1 billion here, \$1 billion there, pretty soon you're talking about real money. But do you know what? That is not what he said. Everett Dirksen, the Senator who said that, actually said, \$1 million here, \$1 million there, pretty soon you're talking about real money. And that was just 45 years ago that he said that. And we've moved from millions to billions to trillions because this Congress doesn't have the fiscal responsibility that would be required by a balanced budget.

There are consequences, serious consequences for every American family and every job holder in this country. And that's why I want to turn to the gentleman from Texas and the gentleman from Colorado to get their perspective on just what happens if we don't get this problem under control.

Mr. CONAWAY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

It is stunning to think that a stack of \$1,000 bills, 1,000 of those, which would equal 1 million bucks would be 4 inches tall. Another way to look at \$1 trillion, if you were to try to spend \$1 trillion in 1 year, to do that, you would have to spend \$32,000 per second every second of the year in order to get, to fight your way through \$1 trillion. It's a staggering amount of money.

The number that doesn't show on your charts there is the unfunded promises that we've made. There is about \$62 trillion in unfunded promises that we've made. To pay off that \$62 trillion—that is the present value of those unfunded promises, this Federal Government over the next 75 years would have to run a \$62 trillion surplus. I don't know who thinks that is even remotely possible to make that happen. The 4 years out of the last 40, I think, that cumulative \$17 billion in surpluses over that 40-plus year period, and now we've added another 10 years to that 40 of deficits.

The first-quarter deficit for fiscal year 2010 is the fourth-largest, and would have been the fourth largest annual deficit ever, just to show you how fast we are running through this money.

The doctor fix, I mentioned that—starting the diet tomorrow. I hope the President comes in tomorrow night and says, we have a looming problem with our doctors and the Medicare reimbursement issue. The Congress gave it a 2-month extension back in December. The fix he referred to is that doctors on Medicare get a 21 percent cut in their reimbursement rates. None of us want to let that happen, period, to our seniors and to our physicians. But by the same token, we don't want to take the fix and simply add that burden to future generations. Let's start tomorrow night with the first doctor fix, which will expire February 28, and have that paid for by cuts in other spending so that we don't, in fact, take a difficult problem—but it's the most, it's the most near-term difficult problem—and show the world that we can fix it.

The other thing I would like to make a point of before I hear from the gentleman from Colorado in terms of what would happen, the Democrats are talking about the economy this and jobs that, all those kinds of things, I don't think there is a single thing we could do more important to incentivizing American jobs than it would be to seriously address this looming financial crisis of the Federal Government. If we were to say, yes, we are serious about balancing a budget, I think the confidence that that would instill in the market, in small businesses and large businesses all over this country, would do more than any \$787 billion stimulus, any \$150 billion stimulus that the House passed over that one Republican vote in December, the \$80 billion stimulus that's being contemplated in the Senate, nothing of that sort will have a dramatic impact the way that balancing this budget, or at least telling the American people we are serious about balancing this budget, with an amendment that requires it; not good faith efforts, but requires a balanced budget.

I don't think there's anything we could do that would stimulate jobs and this economy any better than doing that. The confidence it would instill in this country would be palpable, I would think, if we were to do that.

Mr. GOODLATTE. I thank the gentleman. And I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. COFFMAN. I thank the gentleman from Virginia and appreciate the comments of the gentleman from Texas on this very critical issue about a constitutional amendment for a balanced budget to the U.S. Constitution.

Let me just say about what is the impact as a former small business owner and actually as a former State treasurer for the State of Colorado, what is the impact of this deficit spending on the economy as a whole?

First of all, it's interesting that you hear rumblings around the world from other countries about given the U.S., given their fiscal policies, given their lack of fiscal discipline and how that will impact the dollar in terms of the strength of the dollar, should the dollar still be used as the international reserve currency? But I think the immediate effect that we are going to see certainly is a weakened dollar. And a weakened dollar is going to lead to higher inflation rates. Particularly as the economy tries to expand, you will have private borrowing competing with public borrowing, and that will create a higher demand and higher interest rates. But certainly the perception of a prolonged weakening of the dollar is going to cost us more as borrowers. It will drive up interest rates.

Then also look at just the extraordinary inflationary impacts the chronic deficit spending will have on that economy. I think that those things are shorter. And I believe that those things in concert will choke off the ability for this economy to fully recover. If we do

not control spending soon, it will choke off the ability for this economy to ever fully recover. We will never see, we will never see the prosperity that Americans have experienced up until now. And it has always has been the next generation always had it better than the last. And I believe that we are at a turning point now where unless this Congress changes its ways fairly dramatically fairly soon, this next generation will not have it better than the previous generation.

I yield back.

Mr. GOODLATTE. I agree with the gentleman entirely. We are at great risk.

And let's start with the stimulus. The group speaking just before us were touting the great benefits of this economic stimulus package. We've already seen that during the time that we have been in the process of spending this nearly \$1 trillion, all of which, by the way, is borrowed against our children and grandchildren's future, every penny of it is added to the national debt, but before we mention that we've lost 2.74 million jobs since the stimulus program began, the stimulus is founded on an economic theory, and that is called Keynesian economic theory. This says that if there is an economic downturn, the government will borrow money and use that money to spend on various projects and programs to employ people, and they will then generate economic activity. They will spend the money they earn with other people. That will cause people to manufacture goods in response to that demand, and the economy will start growing.

And this is the last part. This is the part that is always left out when they talk about the economic stimulus package in Keynesian economic theory. The last part of Keynes' theory was that when that economic activity took place, and the result was a growing economy, and there would be increased revenues coming into the Federal Government, that they would use those revenues to pay back the money they borrowed to get the process going.

And every time there is one of these so-called economic stimulus programs, do they pay the money back at the end? No. And it's very clear that there's no such intention here when you have \$800 billion-plus deficits as far as the eye can see, to say nothing of the unfunded liability, the promises that the gentleman from Texas referred to, that is even far, far greater than what we are seeing here on this chart.

And so, that is what really puts the lie to the idea that this stimulus is going to have any long-term good effect.

The first concern I have is that at some point in time the amount of money we've borrowed, when the economy does start to grow, not just in this country but elsewhere in the world, and in some economies, they are already growing, and, in fact, they are

growing at a pretty healthy pace in countries like China and Brazil. They're going to have increased demand to borrow money. And our government is going to have increased demand to borrow money. And that means that at some point, not right now because people are saving money at a higher rate than they ever had, and interest rates are very low, and banks are afraid to lend that money to a lot of people, therefore there is a lot of money in the bank that is not being lent. And therefore interest rates are low. But in the not too distant future, whether it's 1 or 2 years, we are going to see demand for that money rise. And then the point made by the gentleman from Florida, that you will have \$14 trillion, \$18 trillion \$20 trillion accumulated debt and interest rates go up to 5, 6, 7, 8 percent.

I can remember back during the Carter administration in the late 1970s when the prime interest rate got over 20 percent. If we face those kind of interest rates with this amount of debt, the burden on our government is going to be staggering, and therefore the burden on our economy and our people. And it's going to result in very near-term staggering problems in terms of high interest rates, perhaps hyperinflation related to the very weak dollar compared to other currencies around the world. And then we are going to have what it seems like we are already getting into right now, and that is some evidence of some growth in our economy, but continuing to lose jobs. And then, behind that, you have inflation set in. You're going to have the stagflation that people remember from the 1970s and early 1980s.

This is not a prescription for the future of our children and grandchildren. This is a prescription for an economy that will go downhill and have a very, very different future for this country and the people of this country. And it's not too distant when that kind of impact could take place.

I yield to the gentleman from Texas. Mr. CONAWAY. I thank the gentleman. I would just like to add to what you're talking about. U.S. taxpayers have benefited from artificially low interest rates because when the world's economy went bad, a bunch of the money that was out there fled. It was a flight to safety. That money fled into U.S. Treasuries. And we have basically been warehousing that money for folks all over the world at pretty near zero interest rates because they knew they would get it back from the American taxpayer.

What's happening now, with these increased deficits, is not only are we having to issue debt to pay off maturing debt, but we also have to issue new debt to fund these trillion-dollar deficits out there every year. Normally, you would expect that an increasing demand would cause the price of whatever it is you are demanding to get more of to go up. And that hasn't happened because the rest of the world,

like I said, has fled into U.S. Treasuries.

Now, as the gentleman said, economies around the world are beginning to rebound. People are having opportunities to invest their money at higher interest rates or higher expected rates of return. And so we will very soon, one of the first indicators that things are going awry is as you begin to watch the weekly auctions of debt, our interest rates begin to inch up because we have to pay higher interest rates in order to attract lenders to our debt versus the opportunities they have got in other currencies.

□ 2200

This fallacy that the stimulus bill worked is based on the premise that government spending will solve the economic problems of this country.

If that is the case, then this government has spent more money in 2009, 2010, 2011 than has ever been spent in the history of man. So if runaway government of spending were the solution to a vibrant economy, why aren't we in the most vibrant economy ever known? Because we have spent more money out of the Federal Government than has ever been spent before.

It makes no sense that you can continue to borrow greater and greater levels of debt and continue to spend that on programs that, quite frankly, aren't in and of themselves stimulus programs. They are just basically money transfers or transfers of wealth between one group of people and the others. It doesn't create any additional wealth. That cannot sustain itself. But our colleagues across the aisle seem to ignore just the hard common sense that you cannot spend your way out of this problem.

I think it was Ben Franklin who said, You can't stand in a bucket and grab the handles and try to lift yourself off the ground, which is equivalent to trying to tax and spend your way out of a problem. And that is what we have been trying to do with this thing, which is a giant bucket with all of us standing in it.

Mr. GOODLATTE. If the gentleman would yield, I am curious what the gentleman thinks about the speculation the President tomorrow night will call for a spending freeze on discretionary spending.

Obviously, we are pleased that he would want to stop the dramatic trajectory upward in spending that we have seen from this Congress in each of the last 3 years since they have been in the majority. But is that enough? Is that going to solve this problem if we lock in at these higher spending rates that we are experiencing right now?

Mr. CONAWAY. If the gentleman would yield, I would feel a lot better about our President tomorrow night if he would say not only are we going to freeze spending, but we are going to freeze it at 2008 levels.

I go back a couple years. What has happened with the \$787 billion stim-

ulus, much of that money went into already-existing programs and elevated the floor of current spending. And then, on top of that, the 2010 appropriations bill, as our colleague from Colorado said, double-digit increases on that. So we are spending a significant amount of money more in 2010 than we did in 2008.

So if the President would say, All right, let's reset the clock back to 2008, when he first got here, at those levels and then freeze it there, I would feel a lot better about what he is trying to propose tomorrow night.

I do want to point out that it seems as if over the weekend he was going to freeze spending except for defense, homeland security, VA, and foreign affairs. Then I heard today or yesterday that, well, even within the discretionary spending that is going to be frozen, if programs create new jobs, then they are not going to be frozen. So it will be interesting to see what the fine details are tomorrow night on what the President has to say.

Mr. GOODLATTE. And I would add to that that it would be wonderful if this President of the United States, or any leader of our country, would step forward and say what we really need is the kind of discipline that requiring each and every year that we balance the budget would impose upon this Congress. Because we make tough decisions; but, most of the time, when the going gets really tough, they spend money on both.

We talked about PAYGO. The gentleman from Florida mentioned that as well and pointed out that it is really meaningless. If you look at it, they imposed these new rules after the adoption of this new health care bill and the enormous cost of that and claimed that it is being paid for, but do so with smoke and mirrors by taxing for 10 years but only providing benefits for 6 years, and claiming they are going to cut \$500 billion out of Medicare at a time when the number of people eligible for Medicare is going to skyrocket.

Starting this year, 2010, those who turn 65 were born after World War II; and for the next 15 years, the number of people who are eligible for the Medicare program is going to increase dramatically.

During that time, I think we are going to see a need to have significant reform of the Medicare program. But the money saved is going to have to be made available to have more people covered under the program, not to divert it to set up a whole new government spending scheme.

We have been joined by the gentleman from Iowa, and I would like to yield to Mr. KING for his comments about the balanced budget amendment.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) for leading on this Special Order tonight and for leading on fiscal responsibility here in the United States Congress.

This balanced budget amendment is something that I am proud to be an

original cosponsor of. I have done so every time that this has been offered since I have been here in Congress. And the dialogue that is here tonight adds so much to something that has been missing completely, I think, from the administration and from the White House.

We went from a point of Republicans pushing towards a balanced budget and listening to the PAYGO arguments of the Blue Dog Democrats demagoging on the issue. I don't know where they are today. It seems to me that they have gone underground. Maybe they are the Ground Hogs rather than the Blue Dogs at this point.

I don't hear anything from them about balancing the budget any more, because they understand that in order to fund this kind of profligate spending that we have, this \$1.4-plus trillion deficit created by this Obama budget, that, by their method, we would have to raise taxes dramatically.

What I wanted to do is keep the taxes low, slow the growth in government; and for years I said, slow the growth in government so that the economy can catch up. I am now to this point where I would say the other way is that I don't believe the economy can catch up with the spending that we have. I think we actually have to shrink government in order to get it back in line.

This is going to be a very big task. It isn't going to happen under Speaker PELOSI's watch. It isn't going to happen if President Obama has a veto pen to control our spending in this Congress. But we do have an obligation to advance, as much as we can, this constitutional amendment. We have an obligation to offer a balanced budget, which we did this year. The Republican study committee balanced budget, that is something that I had pushed for for some time, and we will have a balanced budget offered this year.

So I just encourage all of my colleagues, Madam Speaker, and everybody in the United States of America to step up to this level of responsibility. If we can do it with our family checkbook, we must do it with our government checkbook. If we fail to do so, our economy will continue in this downward spiral.

We have got to get our capital, our money, our spending back underneath us and realize that government cannot grow us out of this economic problem that we are in. It has got to be the private sector. And the private sector cannot continue to pay the taxes to service the interest and the debt of a deficit that we have been spending under this administration.

I would point out, also, that Speaker PELOSI took the gavel at the end of November elections in 2006, January of 2007. At that time, we saw capital investment in industry go significantly downward. And I watched the members here and the freshmen from the other side tonight talk about how this was all Bush's problem. Well, if they are taking responsibility for anything that

turns good, they have to accept the responsibility for what has happened since Speaker PELOSI took the gavel. All spending starts in the House of Representatives.

I thank the gentleman from Virginia, and I yield back.

Mr. GOODLATTE. I thank the gentleman. And the gentleman raised a very interesting point about how we grow this economy and what this does to it, because he correctly points out that we are going to grow this economy in the private sector, people who will go out and take the risk of creating a new business or expanding the business they have and creating new jobs as a result of that by offering a product or a service that people want and are willing to pay for and can afford to pay for it.

But if the government is out there borrowing \$1.3 trillion, \$1.5 trillion, \$900 billion, and then \$800 billion-plus every year thereafter as far as the eye can see, what is that going to do to the amount of capital that is available in the private sector? Especially if interest rates go up, and the government is absorbing so much of the credit that may be available around the country and other countries, and their growing economies are also competing for those same limited resources, we are going to find it very, very hard for free enterprise to survive if our government keeps spending more than it takes in and keeps growing in the enormous size.

It is projected that if you continue this rate of spending, we are going to have government spending 28 percent of our gross domestic product. The Federal Government, not even counting State and local governments, historically, it has ranged between 18 and 20, 21 percent, which is pretty high, in my mind, and many others as well. But it is nothing compared to having that shoot up to 28 percent. That is a huge additional amount of spending, more than \$1 trillion each and every year.

And as you can see from this chart, almost all of it borrowed, borrowed against the future not only of our children and grandchildren but of the jobs that people hold today and the jobs that 15 million Americans who are out there looking for work hope to get if some employers will take the chance and can get the credit to allow them to start or expand their business.

We have been joined by another Member. I want to point out the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) are members of the House Judiciary Committee, as am I. This is the committee that has jurisdiction over all constitutional amendments, and it is the place where we are pushing the hardest to try to get the Democratic chairman of the committee to examine this legislation, just as it was not that many years ago and passed the House of Representatives on more than one occasion, and on one occasion came within one vote of passing the United

States Senate. Think of what a different country we would have today if we had been living under balanced budgets for the last decade instead of what we have seen.

I would now like to yield to my good friend, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT).

Mr. GOHMERT. I sure thank my friend from Virginia for yielding.

And, yes, we need a balanced budget amendment, and that will do great things. It will strengthen the dollar. It will show the world that we are responsible when it comes to spending for a change. And also, of course, we know that takes ratification of the States and passing both Houses, and we just flat need to do that.

In the meantime, we understand the President may come into this very Chamber and stand right up there and actually suggest that perhaps we ought to freeze the budget of three Departments.

□ 2210

Well, I am so glad that our President is coming around and getting on board with some Republican proposals. This is H.R. 4408. But rather than three departments, this is—and I will read from the bill. It was filed last year. Got lots of Republicans on as cosigners. No Democrats yet. Hope they will come on board once the President starts talking about this. But it says, to amend the Balanced Budget and Deficit Control Act of 1985 to eliminate automatic increases for inflation from CBO baseline projections for discretionary appropriations, and other purposes. It will end the automatic increase in every discretionary budget in the Federal Government.

Now we're talking about being responsible with our spending. No automatic increases every year. Nobody I know of in America gets that kind of thing. If they're working, if they produce, perhaps they'll get an increase. Well, the government shouldn't get automatic increases every year. If you're going to get an increase, it has to be justified. And that has been lacking for so long.

I will just read here. It says, This act may be cited as the Within Our Means Budget—WOMB—Act of 2009; whereas, from passage of this bill will come a new birth of freedom for American taxpayers and an end to the automatic increases for each department that has been bankrupting America.

There are all kinds of good solutions. So I'm proud the President's coming around. Perhaps if we can push him a little further, we can make him even a little more responsible so we start reining in the greatest budget deficit in a 1-year history that has just gone on under this President's watch.

So I appreciate my friend from Virginia yielding, and I look forward to starting to get Democrats, now that the President is talking about some good Republican ideas.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Well, I thank the gentleman for his comments. You

know, Washington, D.C., has a spending addiction, and it has proven to be an addiction that the Congress cannot control without a balanced budget amendment requiring that it make the difficult decisions to balance it each and every year. We have gone in a few short years from a deficit of billions of dollars to a deficit of trillions of dollars and we're printing money at an unprecedented pace, which presents risks of inflation, the likes of which we have never seen. Our debt is mounting rapidly and so is the waste associated with paying the interest on that debt, yet Congress has so far refused to address these unsettling problems.

This is not a partisan addiction. It reaches across the aisle and afflicts both parties, which is why neither party has been able to master it. We need outside help. We need pressure from outside Congress to force us to rein in this out-of-control behavior. We need a balanced budget amendment to the United States Constitution. Families across our country understand what it means to make tough decisions each day about what they can and cannot afford. According to a recent Zogby Interactive survey, approximately 70 percent of Americans said they have reduced spending on entertainment in the past year; 40 percent have limited or canceled vacation plans due to the economic environment; 40 percent have decreased spending on food or groceries; almost 10 percent have either changed their education plans or have chosen not to pursue education plans at all. Most troubling, 16 percent have foregone medical treatment or prescription drugs.

These numbers show how sobering our economic recession is, but they also show something more. They demonstrate a basic principle that honest, hardworking American citizens understand: When your income drops, your spending must drop, one way or the other. Yet, far too frequently this fundamental principle has been lost on a Congress that is too busy spending to pay attention to the bottom line. If Americans must exercise restraint with their own funds, then government officials must be required to exercise an even higher standard when spending other people's hard-earned income.

I urge my colleagues to support the balanced budget amendment to the United States Constitution, House Joint Resolution 1, and I yield back my time.

HEALTH CARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. CHU). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I appreciate the honor to be recognized to address you here on the floor of the House. I appreciate the previous hour, the gentleman from Virginia leading it, talking about the responsibility that we all have to

provide a balanced budget here in this Congress and recognizing that the political forces that are at play here, let's say in Congress and across the country, everybody wants their measure. It has been something where Federal dollars have been distributed on down through the chain from the Federal Government to the State to the counties to the cities, other political subdivisions, parishes. Other examples of that, individual organizations get appropriations.

It has been very, very difficult for this Congress to find the discipline to produce a balanced budget. So that's one of the reasons why I believe strongly that we have got to amend the Constitution so that we have real strict constraints, because Congress hasn't shown the discipline to balance the budget.

That would not be the case for the individuals that are here on the floor tonight that are pushing so hard for this constitutional amendment. Every one of us that are cosponsors of the resolution led by Mr. GOODLATTE would vote for a balanced budget, of course, and we would also and have supported a constitutional amendment.

I wanted to transition the discussion just a little bit tonight, Madam Speaker, from this fiscal responsibility on over to the health care responsibility. First, I'd take us back to the President's statements and throughout the campaign and into his Presidency and after he was inaugurated as President over here on the west portico of the Capitol building, and that was January 20th of last year. That first anniversary just rolled around last Wednesday, Madam Speaker.

The President of the United States, President Obama, said that we are in an economic problem—I don't want to overstate the language he used, but we couldn't fix the economy without first fixing health care, that health care is apparently a contributor. Too much health care spending is a contributor to the economic problems that we are in. So it didn't make sense to me and it didn't connect that when you have what was described as an economic meltdown, a chance that we might be losing the fiscal structure of currency and trade between the countries and the global financial structure, if we're risking a meltdown of the global financial structure, I don't know how we could think the problem of spending too much money on health care, solving that is going to solve the economic potential meltdown. But that was the position that the President took, Madam Speaker, when he said over and over again we can't fix the economy without first fixing health care.

So, even though it didn't make sense, that was the position that President Obama took, and here we are. The average industrialized country spends about 9.5 percent of their GDP on health care. Our numbers are about 14.5 percent of our GDP. Some will say a little over 16 percent of our gross do-

mestic product on health care. So the President's proposal is we spend too much on health care, but his proposed solution is spend more on health care. In fact, spend a lot more on health care, even to the point where he drew a line and said, I won't sign a bill that costs more than \$900 billion.

So the House went through a lot of logical contortionism and contrived a bill that tried to stay underneath that level and then sent it over to the Senate, where they went through a few more, let me say, accounting contortionist activities to try to be able to proscribe their bill from going over \$900 billion, why? Because the President said he didn't want to sign a bill that costs more than \$900 billion.

□ 2220

Well, it turns out that the accounting gimmicks were so stark that anybody else would have been laughed out of the Econ 101 classroom if they had proposed such a thing as, let's say, 10 years of revenue and 5½ to 6 years of cost to get down to a number that's just slightly under \$900 billion. When you look at the first real 10 years, according to Senator JUDD GREGG from down this hallway in the Senate, the first real 10 years is \$2.5 trillion. We have some other numbers out of the House side that shows around \$2.1 trillion in cost for the first 10 years. And when you look at what JOHN SHADEGG has put together, you really see some numbers that escalate all the way up to \$6 trillion.

So the President's problem is, we have an economic problem that he wants to solve by, first, fixing health care because we spend too much money, and we're going to fix it by spending a lot more money, trillions of dollars more, \$1 trillion to \$2 trillion to \$3 trillion to maybe as much as \$6 trillion more. Illogical? As I said, you'd be laughed out of an Econ 101 classroom to come up with an argument that you could do an accounting that showed 5½ years of cost and 10 years of revenue and then claim that it only costs \$900 billion under that.

So we know that's, number one, a flawed premise, a flawed result. The American people understood that, even though the people in the echo chamber in the White House and the leadership chambers here in the House and in the Senate didn't seem to understand that. The second thing, the President of the United States consistently said that we need more competition in health insurance, that the insurance companies aren't competing, they don't have competition. So in order to do that, he proposed that we create a Federal health insurance program. A Federal health insurance program, that the Federal Government get in the business of competing against the private sector health insurance industry.

Now I wonder if the President was briefed on how many health insurance companies we have in the United States. That number is 1,300. There are

1,300 health insurance companies in the United States. Now that would seem to be a lot of competition to me, to have 1,300 companies and have the Federal Government get into this and create one more company—the Federal Government, as big as it is, as much advantage as it would have. Then we would have, though, 1,301 companies in the United States selling health insurance. How many policy varieties do we have? Well, Madam Speaker, that number falls in the area of 100,000 possible policy varieties out there in the marketplace.

So 1,300 companies, 100,000 policy varieties that one could choose from if they could buy insurance across State lines. The President wouldn't go for allowing people to buy insurance across State lines. That would be a little bit too much liberty for an American to have. So instead, he would want to impose a single-payer—he said he was for single-payer many times during the campaign—a single-payer plan, which would be a Federal health insurance plan to supplant or replace all 1,300 companies and 100,000 policies with the beautiful, wonderful Federal Government offerings that would surely be adequate for anybody in America and satisfy all of us, unless we just weren't quite enlightened yet. That seems to be the message I'm hearing from the White House.

So we find out that we had two flawed premises. One was, if we spend too much money on health care, spending more doesn't solve that problem. The second premise was, if health insurance companies need more competition, the way to get it is not to put the Federal Government in the business and try to replace them and drive them out of business. The way to get it is to open up sales across State lines so that that young man that is paying \$6,000 a year for health insurance in New Jersey can buy his health insurance from Kentucky, where a similar policy would cost him \$1,000 a year, not \$6,000. That would be an example of what's going on. If we took the House version of the health care bill, a young man in Indiana, would see his health insurance premiums go up 300 percent. His \$84 a month would be \$252 a month, almost exactly a 300 percent greater health insurance premium because of the mandates and the language that is in the House bill or in the Senate bill.

So the American people watched this, Madam Speaker. They watched it all across America. We watched the reaction, the rejection of the American people of this irresponsible spending. It was discussed pretty deeply in the previous hour. The nationalization of these huge entities, which was discussed by the Democrats in the hour before. It sounded to me like George Bush had nationalized all of these companies and had taken over the private sector, and now here we are, President Obama is stuck with all of that, and that they don't really have any choice, except to go do a lot more of what it

was that they said that George Bush did that was wrong.

Well, I'm not here to make a statement into the RECORD that George Bush got it all right, Madam Speaker. He got a lot of it right. A few of the things history will judge that he didn't get quite as right. But what we have seen in the last 16 or 17 months—and at least 12 of them have been under the Obama presidency—we have seen the nationalization of eight huge formerly private-sector entities, entities that are making a profit and competing in the private sector. That's three large investment banks, AIG the insurance company, Fannie Mae, Freddie Mac, General Motors, Chrysler. And throughout all of that, put on one end the \$700 billion worth of TARP and on the other end the \$787 billion worth of economic stimulus plan that looks like maybe only about a third of that has been spent at this point, but they still want another \$150 billion or more dollars in Son of Stimulus, or Stim II, some call it.

This is Keynesian economics on steroids, and I have heard the President say—and I doubt if he will make this statement from this Well, Madam Speaker, tomorrow night—I have heard him say that Franklin Delano Roosevelt's New Deal actually did work, but the problem that he had was in the second half of the decade of the 1930s. He failed to spend enough money. If he would have just spent a lot more money, then the New Deal would have actually been a good deal, but FDR got a little nervous about spending too much money, so he pulled back. Those were the words the President used, "pulled back." And then what we had, according to his description, was a recession within a depression, and it was brought about by the Federal Government not spending enough money. Well, this wild program, these Keynesian economics on steroids have been driven by this presidency—not driven by George Bush—driven by President Obama.

And by the way, every nickel and dime, every nationalization, every single move that was taken in the last months of the Presidential campaign and in the last months of the Bush presidency, were all things that were approved by and supported by President Obama. He voted for TARP. He spoke for TARP. He sat at the table in the White House and spoke in favor of TARP. That's \$700 billion, and you can't hardly say that it was not President Obama's responsibility when he spoke for, went to the White House and negotiated for it, voted for it and took it over—and by the way, that TARP was only—and I say only, Madam Speaker. The original TARP was \$350 billion. That's half of what Henry Paulson asked for. The other \$350 billion had to be approved and authorized by a President to be elected later, by a Congress to be elected later. That's this Congress, this 111th Congress. That's this President, President

Obama. It's the Pelosi Congress, the Reid Senate, and the Obama presidency, all of this except \$350 billion in spending.

So it brings us to this point where the American people have seen that they thought that they had elected people that were responsible, that understood high finance and the whole big picture that a government has to do so well—that is this constitutional Republic, this representative form of government, Madam Speaker. And so when we saw the TARP plan come through and the nationalizations of a couple large banks and then AIG, and we watched how some of those insider deals worked out pretty good in the long run for those people that were inside, as we marched down this line—Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac—the American people were getting ever more nervous at the spending and the nationalization, the government takeover of private business.

But when they got to the takeover of the car companies, Madam Speaker, that, for sure, wasn't George Bush. That was all President Obama. When that happened, the American people's lightbulbs came on because they know cars. And when the car czar turned out to be a 31-year-old fellow that had never sold or made a car—we don't know if he actually ever fixed one or what he drove—but in any case, he was not qualified to be the car czar, and I think that that was a universal opinion or he wouldn't have been gone.

But the American people saw with that example that the Federal Government, that they really didn't know what they were doing inside the White House echo chamber, and they got ever more uneasy, ever closer to the civil type of a revolt that took place. We saw it happen in Virginia, and then we saw it happen again in New Jersey, and then in Massachusetts a little over a week ago when SCOTT BROWN was elected to the United States Senate—the most improbable place. And when the exit polling was tabulated, and they asked people, Why did you go vote for SCOTT BROWN? Over 70 percent said, I did so because I want to kill the bill.

□ 2230

I want to kill the socialized medicine bill. Madam Speaker, that bill may be dead. On the other hand, it might be a—I know it's a monster. It might be a cold-blooded monster. And on a cold day, and it is a cold day here, you can't tell if a cold-blooded monster is alive or dead. But I want to make sure that it's dead and that bill stays dead and that the American people are glad that it is dead, and they don't want to see it resurrected by the White House, by the Speaker of the House, by the majority leader of the United States Senate or anybody else.

They breathed a big sigh of relief and a shout of joy went up all over America when Massachusetts elected SCOTT BROWN, because people are going to be allowed to keep their liberty. And we

want to make sure they're allowed to keep their liberty. And for that reason, some of us, and my colleague from Texas certainly in the middle of this, worked to put together a declaration of health care independence. We want to put a marker down that we all adhere to, that we can keep our word on because there remain people in government, I mean, at least in Congress, that do give their word and keep their word.

As cavalier as it's been dealt with here in the last few months coming out of the White House, those of us that'll sign on this declaration of health care independence, we intend to lay our word down and keep our word. And I say that here, and I haven't backed up on mine. Neither has the gentleman from Texas. I think I'd get along pretty good in east Texas. There's some times I'd like to go down there and visit those folks because it's quite interesting the people that they send up here from that territory. And I'd like to yield so much time as he may consume to my friend, the gentleman from Texas, Judge GOHMERT.

Mr. GOHMERT. Well, I thank my friend from Iowa (Mr. KING). And I know from having visited Iowa, it's composed of extraordinary people as well. And I tell you, just in the last month we have seen extraordinary things across the country, from Massachusetts, for one, for, we saw when we had a Senator take—basically hold up the health care bill, many of us hoped it was going to be on good principle, but it turned out it was just for money to take back to his State.

But here, again, you had to love the people in America's heartland. I think the gentleman from Iowa knows where Nebraska is. And here the Senator comes back and says, you know, gee, I negotiated hundreds of millions of dollars for you here in this State at the expense of the whole rest of the country. And what did Nebraskans say? The vast majority said, we don't want that dirty money. That's not ours. We don't want extorted money. We don't want dirty money. We just want fairness. And you've just got to love folks that have that sense of equity and fairness and justice and understand where the country came from.

And so it's that spirit, that same spirit that started a revolution back in—going back to 1775 and 1776, with the production, as we know, in July, of the Declaration of Independence. And what a historic time that was. What a powerful time that was. And we know, going back to those days, that now we have the letter that John Adams wrote Abigail after the signing of the Declaration of Independence. In the last part of the letter he says, talking about the celebration and the incredible event that had occurred, the coming together, the first draft of course that Jefferson did, and of course the first person he showed it to was then John Adams.

They politically were at odds, but they were friends at that time, very

close friends, even though they fussed and argued over political issues. And then Adams was just taken aback with how fantastic the document was. He may or may not have made some minor changes. And then second to see it was Benjamin Franklin. Now, Benjamin Franklin made more changes, the editor and publisher that he was. And then that was brought to the body, and they debated and they fussed and they came up with this, the final declaration. And after they had come together, they signed it.

The last part of John Adams' letter to his wife, Abigail, was this, his words: I'm apt to believe that it, the day of the signing of the declaration, will be celebrated by succeeding generations as the great anniversary festival. We call it July 4, Independence Day. It ought to be commemorated as the day of deliverance by solemn acts of devotion to God Almighty. John Adams' words. It ought to be solemnized with pomp and parade, with shows, games, sports, guns—of course we use fireworks instead of guns quite so much now—bells, bonfires, illumination from one end of this continent to the other from this time forward forever more.

Then he goes on very seriously to Abigail, and he says, You will think me transported with enthusiasm, but I am not. I am well aware of the toil and blood and treasure that it will cost us to maintain this declaration and to support and defend these States. Yet, through all the gloom, I can see the rays of ravishing light and glory. I can see that the end is more than worth all the means, and that posterity will triumph in that day's transaction which I trust in God we will not rue.

So that's basically the gist of the end of the letter, and that was quite an occasion. In other correspondence he had said, you know, we have within our grasp the opportunity to govern ourselves that people have only dreamed about, that theologians have written and talked about, but it's within our grasp to govern ourselves. But then we also know that one of Thomas Jefferson's great lines was, The normal course of things is for liberty to yield and government to gain. And that's what we've been seeing, particularly for the last year or so.

Liberty has been yielding and government has been gaining. We know that government is where the jobs have been gained, not in the private sector, not liberty jobs, not jobs of freedom, but government taking more and more away from the private sector. And then we see this health care monstrosity, 2,000 pages, not about health care. You know, we've heard people say, it's about the government taking over one-sixth of the economy. But I like the way our friend, TOM PRICE, put it. It's not about taking over one-sixth of the economy. It's about taking over 100 percent of every individual. That's what it's about.

And so, as my friend from Iowa knows, we've spent many, many hours

with friends like MICHELLE BACHMANN and others, so many others up here on Capitol Hill, putting our heads together and working, giving and take, to come up with a document that really declares what we believe about health care. And I imagine my friend from Iowa is as sick as I am of hearing people, even here on the floor, come in and say, well, Republicans, they don't want reform. They're the party of no, no, no. We have over 40 bills that are good solutions to health care problems.

And I know that my friend from Iowa agrees: we need reform. We want reform to health care. We cannot have the costs continue to skyrocket like nothing else in this country. We can't have that. We need reform, but we don't need more government. We need health care reform. And it was in that spirit of coming together, not with something as dramatic as John Adams and Thomas Jefferson and Ben Franklin and those incredible intellects came up with with the original Declaration of Independence, but really with that, just a modicum of that great spirit of independence that they had and not wanting government to gain and liberty to yield, but wanting liberty to triumph and yet everyone have the opportunity for life, liberty and pursuit of happiness.

□ 2240

So in that spirit, the Declaration of Health Care Independence was put together. No one got shot. No one lost their fortunes, as did so many of those 56 signers of the original Declaration. We owe them so much. But we also owe them not to continue to allow liberty to yield and government to gain. They told us what would happen. Read their writings. Read their quotes. We owe them better than that.

And that is why it's going to be so great to have so many people coming together and say, I am making this declaration. I am pledging that we are going to adhere to those principles of liberty and yet providing a better chance for health care with affordable health care under patient control where the relationship between a doctor and patient doesn't have a government intermediary, doesn't have an insurance company getting in between the patient and doctor.

It gets us back to something that has been missing for so long, and that is a regular doctor-patient relationship. And to think in that 2,000 pages, one of the biggest parts of it is we're going to bring all of the health care records to Washington and we're going to store them here for you because that way we will know all of your deepest, darkest, private secrets. There is nothing your government won't know once we get holed up every one of your most private medical records. That was a big deal.

You hear them say, well, we'll cut this out, we'll cut that out, because they know when they have every person's medical records in Washington,

D.C.—and under both the Senate and the House bill you make the Internal Revenue Service the enforcement arm for a health care bill, the worst of all world's—the government knowing all of your most private secrets about your own body and the Internal Revenue Service having access to them and to your finances to bring about, as TOM PRICE says, a hundred percent control over your body, that is something that should be intolerable. That is why we need a Declaration of Health Care Independence.

And I know there are friends across the aisle who believe abortion is just fine; it's just tearing the tissue out. I know we have other friends like BART STUPAK who know what abortion is, that it's taking a life. But surely, surely we can get the vast majority in this body to agree that taxpayers should be protected from being forced to pay for abortion when they know and believe in their hearts it is taking the life of our most vulnerable people.

There is just so much that needs to be done to drive a stake through the heart of this terrible monstrosity called the health care reform bill.

With that, I yield back to my friend from Iowa.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Reclaiming my time, listening to the gentleman from Texas recount the circumstances by which the Declaration of Independence was written, and I recall reading through a fair amount of that history and watching a movie or two, some of the frustration that Thomas Jefferson felt with John Adams' scrutiny of his language and later on Ben Franklin's and then the broader Congress, I've never been in a position where I could so sympathize with Thomas Jefferson as I do. But also I so much more appreciate the artful work of the Declaration of Independence because it was a product of a lot of fruitful minds that had to come together and to be able to take all of the ideas and patch them together and then turn it into something that is beautifully eloquent at the same time. It's pretty hard to do. It's like a piece of sheet music and trying to patch in different stanzas here and there and have it come out and have it actually play right before the orchestra.

And the Declaration of Independence has stood up under the tests of time as one of the most beautifully written documents anywhere. But part of the reason is not just its eloquence but because it speaks to the heart of humanity. We know we hold these truths to be self-evident, that we are endowed by our Creator with certain unalienable rights.

I wonder what Thomas Jefferson would think if he could go down to to the Jefferson Memorial and realize that of the four panels inside of the memorial, three of them—the quotes of Jefferson—three of them referenced his belief in God. It's hard for the people on this side to argue that Jefferson was a Deist when three of his quotes referenced God.

And, by the way, there are two typos in there, Madam Speaker, that I would challenge the historians to go down there and check on them. One of them comes to mind right away. The other one I'll think of when I go back down there to read it.

I wanted to take up this issue of our Declaration of Health Care Independence which will be rolled out tomorrow, and we will lay it out in more of a clear, concise form. But it's laid out on these principles that you've heard Mr. GOHMERT talk about and the prediction of what would happen—let me say what would have happened if that horrible socialized medicine bill would have been sent to the President's desk where, if he could sign his name at all, he certainly would have signed the bill. He had no reservations about what was coming out of the Pelosi House and Reid Senate. The people of Massachusetts did; the President did not. And the American people line up against this in any form, any of these forms that have been proposed, at least 70 percent in opposition.

And so here's why first the American people lined up against this socialized medicine proposal, either the House or Senate version or the ObamaCare as it's sometimes described, because we know that a Washington takeover—and the American people know, Madam Speaker, that a Washington takeover of American health care would deny fundamental personal and economic liberties, and it would devalue our individual liberties, and it would reduce the principle of limited government as established by the Constitution. That's number one.

It would have increased costs and taxes upon every entity that we could possibly mention, and it would have crippled our American economy, and it would have created inescapable new taxes, mandates. If the Federal Government were for the first time in the history of the United States to produce or approve a product and then require every American to purchase that product—the people that couldn't afford it, send them a check and then say, Use this voucher to buy yourself some health insurance, or, by the way, If your employer has 50 or more employees, they have to provide your health insurance for you. Unless you're in the construction business, then it's five or more employees because of the exemption that was written in by the construction labor union. So all of these little construction companies that are sitting here with five and maybe tomorrow are going to have six employees, they're only going to have five—those that have six through 49 would be treated differently than every other employer because they were in the construction business, because somebody in the construction business had unions that were strong enough to leverage a piece of favoritism into the legislation.

But if there is a mandate there, it is a tax. Whether it is a tax that is levied

and you have to pay the tax to the IRS and they go out and buy your insurance for you or if the Federal Government mandates you go out and buy that insurance, the only difference is who actually handles the transaction. You handle it yourself to avoid the IRS levy against you, which would be the fine. The punishment for not paying it, the same thing. A mandate to buy insurance, to compel people to buy a product produced or approved by the Federal Government for the first time in history that that has ever been done is a tax, a new tax, and it's a new tax on everybody that has to participate that wasn't otherwise or wouldn't otherwise have been participating.

That is one of the other bad things about this. It would institutionalize, Madam Speaker, a massive, ever-expanding Federal bureaucracy that is impersonal and impractical. And that bureaucracy would devise new ways to grow and get more power and diminish the liberties of the American people. That's the nature of bureaucracies. They've always done that. And we've put people in white shirts and ties and sent them off in an expensive Federal building, and then they set about building empire. And they'll come back here and say, We need a little more empire, and they'll write rules that we'll never see. And those rules will have the full force and effect of law, because this Congress has abdicated a lot of our responsibility when it comes to rules.

So the bureaucracy grows. The huge administration state grows.

And it also would have—and I say "have" because I believe this bill is dead and I want to make sure it stays dead—it would have empowered bureaucrats to interfere with a doctor-patient relationship and that the process of doing so would have undermined quality, would have limited choice, would have increased the costs.

These were the downsides that were coming at the American people that caused them to rise up and express themselves in two Governor races. Those were nationalized races in Virginia and in New Jersey. And when they had the opportunity to have a national election for a United States Senator in Massachusetts, they took it.

□ 2250

The American people appealed to the decency of the elected majorities. And their leaders here in this Congress did not respond, except to do more force-feeding of liberal, social engineering policies, expensive policies and things that people don't want. The level of elitism and arrogance is breathtaking. And I don't think it has ever reached this high in the history of America. That cavalier disregard for the Constitution, when someone would ask Speaker PELOSI, where in the Constitution do you see the constitutional authority to pass a national health care act such as you have done here out on the floor of the House of Representatives? A cavalier attitude, Madam Speaker.

We take an oath to this Constitution. And people will take the oath. They will do so with their hand on a Bible, and they will walk out with no other thought to it at all. There is a whole movement over on this side of this Congress that believes the Constitution doesn't mean what it says. They will make that argument. I sit on the Constitution Subcommittee. I have heard the argument over and over again, a living, breathing Constitution. Some time back in the 1930s, the Supreme Court had some language threaded into a decision that says that the Constitution is living and breathing.

If the Constitution is living and breathing, if it doesn't mean what it says, then, Madam Speaker, I would ask the question, what is it for? Who is protected by a Constitution that is living and breathing and changing and can be amended by the whim of any judge in any Federal courtroom anywhere in America? I had an attorney tell me once, if you give me a favorable judge and a favorable jury, I will amend the Constitution in any courtroom in the land. And that happens by precedents that find their way up to the Supreme Court.

I take this stand, Madam Speaker. That's this: This Constitution does mean what it says. The text of it means what it says. And it means what it was understood to mean at the time of the ratification, either the base document, or the amendments if things flowed through. And if it's something else, then the Constitution is no guarantee whatsoever. It simply is an artifact of history, or else it can serve as a shield for someone in a black robe to hold up and make the argument that you're a layperson, so you can't begin to understand what this Constitution means. Leave it to us. We're the professionals in the black robes. We dropped the powdered wigs; we still have the black robes.

I don't think putting a robe on makes a person exclusive when it comes to understanding the English language. I think we have a lot of people—and I'm a ditchdigger by trade. A lot of people digging ditches can read this Constitution and understand what it means. I think we have a lot of TEA party patriots that do read the Constitution and understand what it means. We see a lot of people standing under American flags and yellow "Don't Tread on Me" flags with a Constitution in their pocket. They understand what it means better than some of the people who have taken an oath of the Constitution in this House of Representatives, Madam Speaker.

This Constitution is threatened by socialized medicine, the bill that has to stay dead.

We also offer solutions and a framework to go forward, a solution and framework to go forward, and we say, we the people and representatives of the United States, make this declaration, that as a matter of principle, we want to protect the doctor-patient re-

lationship which the gentleman from Texas talked about. And we want to reject this national debt that gets heaped up on us over and over again that was the subject of the previous hour. And we want to improve quality of care, and we want transparency in the negotiations. And we want to treat every American citizen in this same fashion that we treat our public officials, and vice versa. If it's good enough for an American citizen, it ought to be good enough for an elected public official, wherever they might be serving.

And I appreciate the discussion about the funding for abortion. When there's a policy that is seeking to be advanced by this side of the aisle in the United States Congress that would compel the taxpayers to fund abortions, something that is abhorrent to the value system of America, the majority value system of America, that is about as egregious as it can get, to be roped into being a citizen, held down to pay your taxes and have that money extracted out of your pocket to go to the Planned Parenthood or the abortion clinic.

When you think of conscientious objecting taxpayers, that is about as close as you can get to having a complete revolt on your hands. And when I looked out last Friday at the March for Life, the numbers in the Mall here and standing on that stage, people as far as the eye could see. It was reported to be in the neighborhood of 200,000 pro-life people bussed from all over this country, and some flew in to come and stand up and march, pray and speak for life, as they do every year, as they do every day in these United States. That is the largest continuing demonstration in the history of this country. There's no movement that has brought those numbers of people here to Washington, D.C., year after year after year for 37 years. And to think what they would have had to say and do if there had been a socialized medicine bill passed that compels people to fund abortions or brokers policies that pay for abortions. Those people that came, I among them, would have been in even greater numbers than 200,000. And at some point they aren't going to be as polite as this good group of people are when they see that happening.

So I'm glad that marker has been put down. The new mandates that are being proposed on patients, employers, on States—we've heard from the States. In fact, that is the Corn Husker Kickback. "Exempt me from the cost of the new mandates" is what that statement was. But in reality, there was a moral portion that was negotiated in that, too, and it was language that didn't hold up to the standard of the Stupak amendment, which wasn't good enough for me. I supported it, but I would have liked to have done more and better.

It was an eroded standard that was offered in the United States Senate. And it was rejected by the pro-life organizations in the country. That moral position appeared to have been traded

off for a monetary one, which is an exemption from paying the increases in Medicaid that would come about because of the socialized medicine bill in the Senate that brought about these special deals. Special deals, Madam Speaker, for—let's see, let's go to Maine. Was that \$11 billion for community health clinics in Maine? Eleven billion dollars. Well, there's a kickback there. That didn't get a lot of publicity. But that is part of the deal.

The exemption from the—say the elimination of the Medicare Advantage programs in Florida for that Senator NELSON, the Corn Husker Kickback in Nebraska, the Louisiana Purchase in Louisiana, the list goes on. We don't know what all is in the bill. Those we do know about. Those are all special deals. All those special deals are completely rejected by this declaration.

Another one of those mandates that came would be setting up health insurance policies in the country that are funded by the taxpayer and that compel employers to insure their employees or individuals to buy the insurance if they are not working or if they have an employer that is not mandated to buy. And within all of that we would fund illegals, give them their own health insurance policies so we could put another, bigger magnet out here, a jobs magnet, a welfare magnet, and now your own private health insurance policy magnet, argued and defended for by LUIS GUTIERREZ, for example, and Mr. HONDA of California. Many others believe that it's a matter of social justice that American people would owe a health insurance policy, an individual health insurance policy, to people that break into the United States illegally.

What a reach that is from a justice standpoint.

We cannot be expanding any further benefits, health care benefits to illegals in America. We provide emergency services by law. And a lot of times, we don't backfill the bank accounts of the health care providers. For example, if you go down to Arizona, in Arizona the most southerly trauma center is the University of Tucson Hospital. That is at least 70 miles north of the Mexican border because the rest of those hospitals have closed. They can't afford to provide free health care services to the illegals. And the American taxpayers can't afford to pay them either. So those are some of the things that are on the list here and things that are important for us to talk about.

I'm happy to yield to the gentleman from Texas to pick up where I left off.

Mr. GOHMERT. I appreciate the gentleman from Iowa pointing these things out. And I do recall in the President's address here in this very Chamber back in September, I believe he said in that speech that there would be no funding abortion. Now the trouble for us was that some people in this body actually read and had been reading the House bill. And there was one section there, and I don't have the bill

with me, I have got a copy all tabbed that I have gone through because I was reading the bill. And shockingly, even though, the President said there won't be a penny going for abortions, you turn right there, and there's a section title that says "abortions," for which Federal funding can be spent or approved. And you go, whoa, I guess the President didn't know about that.

□ 2300

We heard the President say there is no money in this health care bill that is going to go for illegal aliens, and I think one of our friends hollered out about that time. When the fact is, as we know, when the House health care bill passed, one of the things that had been written up in the local papers were there were Members across the aisle that said: if you put a requirement in this bill that people show identification to show that they are legally here, they are legal residents and therefore legally getting the health care insurance benefits, then we are voting against the bill.

Some of us think that should have been the motion to recommit, and that would have of course either gotten the bill pulled or it would have gone down in defeat if our friends across the aisle who said they would vote "no" if that was in there had been voted for and approved.

But the way it stood, I think most everybody in here knew, except for the President—we know he wouldn't lie because the Parliamentarians told us that—but when he said that there would be no funding for illegal aliens, he didn't know, apparently, because if he did, it would have been a lie. So, obviously he didn't know that unless there was a requirement for identification in order to get the proceeds, then they are entitled to get the proceeds, illegally here or not. And obviously he didn't know that, or he wouldn't have said it.

I have a dream that one day the President's promises are going to be kept. I have a dream it is going to happen. And I know when the President told America eight different times on television that we are going to have all these negotiations on C-SPAN, I know some day we are going to have all these negotiations on C-SPAN. It hasn't happened yet, because I have been trying to find out where the negotiations are going on so we could have true transparency.

It was a great idea when the President said it, so that people all over the country can see who is negotiating for them, who is negotiating for the pharmaceuticals, who is negotiating for the insurance companies, who is negotiating for the plaintiffs' lawyers, who is negotiating for AARP, and who is really standing on the side of the retired folks. We would be able to see all that and it would be transparent.

When I heard him saying that over and over on television throughout the Presidential campaign, I have to say, I

thought, now, that is not a bad idea. That is a good idea. We will make this totally transparent. And even though I am a Republican, I have to say, the President had a good idea.

Now, the trouble is we have got to get him to follow through. Once he won the election based on things he promised, we need to get him to follow through, because he did have some good ideas and the American people liked those ideas.

If you go back and look at the exit polling data from 2008, November, when the President won, indications are two-thirds of the people in America said they voted for President Obama, and jobs and the economy was the number one issue. I believe it was about 10 percent who said that health care was a big deal to them, health care reform. So I think he misread the results.

People wanted job assistance, get jobs going. We know that 70 percent of the jobs come from small business; yet his stimulus bill provided less than 1 percent in loans and assistance for small business.

He told America, well, this is going to create infrastructure. Might as well do that. And it turns out less than about 7 percent of that bill went for infrastructure.

So I think it is important that when the President has a good idea, this body follow through, whether the President wants to follow through or not. And these things should be transparent. It should be open.

The 40 bills that we have as solutions and great ideas to helping reform health care, because we want reform, we need reform, they ought to be listened to. There are some great ideas. And one of them would be complete transparency, and that is one of the things we want people to pledge, that you need transparency.

The President was right when he was a candidate. He hasn't been right on that point since he has been President, but he was sure right as a candidate. And you look at the Declaration of Health Care Independence that we hope that lots of folks will sign tomorrow, transparency is a critical issue.

Now, when you have a health care system where the big insurance companies, whether it is Blue Cross or Aetna or any of them, where they get one really, really cheap price and the government pays a small amount, but if you come in and pay cash because you are a hardworking, lower-middle class person that is struggling to make every dime and to make every dime stretch, and then you come in and you pay several times what the insurance company or the government pays when you are paying cash, the system is upside down. It needs reform.

And we do need to say, as candidate, now President, said, you have got to have transparency. You have got to see who is selling out whom. And so if there were a group that said, We are for retired persons, and yet they didn't care what their members said, and they

were losing members right and left who were dropping their dues, but you found out they make a lot more money from selling insurance than they do from people paying dues and they are getting a special deal and have millions more buying their insurance, then you would have some idea.

And they also maybe negotiate that their executives will not be under the same pay cap that most other executives under the Federal insurance exchange part of it, people would notice that if they are watching it on C-SPAN, and they might get upset at anybody who says, I am representing retired persons, publicly, but in negotiations they cut deals for their executives and not for their retired people.

Those are the things that need to be brought out. Those are the kinds of things that I know folks tomorrow, when they sign the Declaration of Health Care Independence, will be thinking about. You need transparency. You need accountability and oversight.

One of the things we saw with the Madoff scandal, with the credit default swaps scandal, with AIG overextending on selling those, Goldman Sachs selling themselves in with AIG, and then their former chairman getting them the massive bailouts so that they could have the biggest, most healthy profiting year in history this last year, all these kinds of things going on, you need transparency and you need somebody standing up for the people. You need reform. And the government should be about oversight. It should be about making sure there is a fair, level playing field.

And then the government doesn't play. They are referees. We don't need them as players. We need them as referees. That is an obligation this body has fallen down on badly in the preceding years, and it is time we got back to it.

Those are things that need to be part of reform. The government should be about making sure people play fair, not being the bully player on the field that muscles everybody else off of it. Those are the kinds of things we need to be about.

And when you think of the things that have been represented and what turned out to be true, people were told, well, this group came out with a study that said if you are between 40 and 50 and you are a woman, you shouldn't get a mammogram. And then they are told, well, that wouldn't have the power of law. Then they get to finding out, well, gee, if this bill passes, what that body just said is going to be part of the law. And if you are 40 to 50, you don't get a mammogram.

How many women have had their lives saved because they were able to get a mammogram between 40 and 50, and they found that little tumor early while it was still localized, at a time where they were allowed in the United States to have a 98 percent chance of success and no cancer at 5 years;

whereas, in England, where they have the socialized medicine that some of our friends across the aisle are trying to drive us to, they have about 20 percent less success, and about 20 percent more die of cancer. They don't need to if you let them have the mammogram when they need it.

And those are the kinds of things that need to come out. People need to know those. I yield back.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Reclaiming my time, I thank the judge from Texas.

On the transparency side of this discussion, too, to broaden that out, Madam Speaker, when I address transparency, I am speaking of two things. One is transparency in the negotiations, so everything is out there in sunlight. And the other is transparency in billing, so people know what is being paid for health care services.

The part about the negotiations that is so important, if they took place on C-SPAN out in the open, out in the light of day, if it is a big negotiating table that is there and in comes Big Pharma and here comes AARP, here is the health insurance companies, here is a doctor sitting over here. The patients, I would like to think they have a place at the table, but I am not sure just what entity speaks up so well for them.

□ 2310

But here's how a piece of legislation gets passed in this Congress today. This is what happens. Think of the scales of justice, blindfolded. Justice is blind, and here they are balancing these scales of justice. That's what I see. There's an image in that; that image of justice and equity. I'm reluctant to use the word "fair."

But in legislation, it works out this way. It's kind of a scale, and somebody comes up with a bad idea. Let's just say it's cap-and-trade or it's socialized medicine. They put all their ideas over here and, clink, here's the way the scale sits. All the bad ideas weigh it down. And then people start to say, Well, wait a minute. I've got a couple of ideas that are pretty bad. Let's take them off the table and put an idea over here you think is a good idea. And then it starts to weigh a little bit. You don't see that scale move. It's still sitting there.

Then one large entity after another starts to come to a conclusion that passage of this bad bill is inevitable. So they take away their opposition to a bad bill and they begin to negotiate for their own carve-outs and exemptions in a bad bill so it damages everybody but them. When they get their carve-out, the political capital over here that is on the "no" side either goes to neutral or over here on the plus side because they've agreed to support a bill now because they've got their exemptions so they're not affected by the bill. That might be the Cornhusker Kickback. That might be the Florida exemption for Medicare Advantage or the \$11 billion in clinics in Maine or the Lou-

isiana Purchase or it might be exemptions from executive pay controls in Big Pharma. It could be anything. They will add and add and add over on this side until all of this "no" political capital that knew it was a bad idea when it began, enough that has moved over to the plus side or moved to neutral to where if you put that final little weight on the scales—I like to call it the straw that breaks the camel's back—clink, it goes over this way.

Now there's enough support to pass a bill. And that's when they ram it through and they don't let you up for air because they're afraid they will lose votes. When that little moment comes when they think they've got the votes, it comes through. That's why the United States Senate was doing business for 3 constant weeks without a break and that's why they were doing business on Christmas Eve, to pass socialized medicine with a 60–40 majority on December 24, Christmas Eve, because they finally stacked the scales to the point where, clink, it would go over on the side where they could barely pass the bill. That's what they did.

If those kind of negotiations are taking place out in the open where the American people understand it, they would be revolted by the concept of how this is business, how very little of it is a discussion about what is the best policy for America and how much of it is a discussion about how you get the support of this group or that group or how you leverage to get the vote of a Member of Congress or United States Senator. Instead of evaluating the policy and stepping back and looking at it objectively and coming up with new ways to make something right for the American people, it becomes a political equation.

If we could get it out in the sunlight, we could get rid of some of those political equations and come a lot closer to getting the right policy for the American people. That's why transparency matters so much. That's why C-SPAN in those negotiation rooms would matter so much. That is actually a very big part of this Declaration of Health Care Independence. And I am proud to be part of it, and I'm looking forward to our press conference tomorrow.

I'd be happy to yield just a moment to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. GOHMERT. I understand we just have 1 minute left, but I appreciate so much Mr. KING from Iowa taking this time to point out what we need in the way of health care reform. It isn't the massive 2,000-page monstrosity. It's true transparency. It's true accountability. And I appreciate this discussion with my friend from Iowa tonight.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Reclaiming my time, I thank my friend from Texas for being up late at night and coming down here. When you have a friend that will stand with you like Judge GOHMERT, in the end we can, I think, together, do some good things for the American people, Madam Speaker. So we'll be working to get to that point.

We want to empower rather than limit an open and accessible marketplace of health care choice and opportunity. And if we're going to do business now, the rules have changed. There are new rules for the road. These are the new rules for road, and we're going to find out when people are serious. If they're ready to address lawsuit abuse, the people that are advocating for socialized medicine, if they're ready to address lawsuit abuse, we're ready to do business. If not, there's a new sheriff in town.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. ELLISON (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today on account of travel problems.

Mr. ORTIZ (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today on account of health reasons.

Mr. CRENSHAW (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for January 19 through 27 on account of medical reasons.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Ms. WOOLSEY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. MALONEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GRAYSON, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. POE of Texas) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. FORTENBERRY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. POE of Texas, for 5 minutes, February 2.

Mr. MORAN of Kansas, for 5 minutes, February 2.

Mr. DREIER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. JONES, for 5 minutes, February 2.

Mr. CAO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK, for 5 minutes, today.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 2950. An act to extend the pilot program for volunteer groups to obtain criminal history background checks, to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The Speaker announced her signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 2949. An act to amend section 1113 of the Social Security Act to provide authority for

increased fiscal year 2010 payments for temporary assistance to United States citizens returned from foreign countries, to provide necessary funding to avoid shortfalls in the Medicare cost-sharing program for low-income qualifying individuals, and for other purposes.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Lorraine C. Miller, Clerk of the House reports that on January 22, 2010 she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bill.

H.R. 4462. To accelerate the income tax benefits for charitable cash contributions for the relief of victims of the earthquake in Haiti.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KING of Iowa. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 15 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, January 27, 2010, at 10 a.m.

EXPENDITURE REPORTS CONCERNING OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL

Reports concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized for Speaker-authorized official travel during the fourth quarter of 2009, pursuant to Public Law 95-384 are as follows:

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO PANAMA, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN DEC. 11 AND DEC. 14, 2009

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. John A. Boehner	12/11	12/14	Panama		906.00		(³)				906.00
Hon. Dan Boren	12/11	12/14	Panama		906.00		(³)				906.00
Hon. Kevin Brady	12/11	12/14	Panama		906.00		(³)				906.00
Hon. David Dreier	12/11	12/14	Panama		906.00		(³)				906.00
Hon. Devin Nunes	12/11	12/14	Panama		906.00		(³)				906.00
Hon. Peter Roskam	12/11	12/14	Panama		906.00		(³)				906.00
Hon. Ileana Ros-Lehtinen	12/11	12/14	Panama		906.00		(³)				906.00
Paula Nowakowski	12/11	12/14	Panama		906.00		(³)				906.00
Michael Sommers	12/11	12/14	Panama		906.00		(³)				906.00
Jennifer Stewart	12/11	12/14	Panama		906.00		(³)				906.00
Committee total											9,060.00

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

³ Military air transportation.

HON. JOHN A. BOEHNER, Jan. 11, 2010.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2009

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²

HOUSE COMMITTEES

Please Note: If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate and return. ☐

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. ROBERT A. BRADY, Chairman, Jan. 8, 2010.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2009

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Raul Grijalva	10/8	10/11	Spain		799.00		6,338.00				7,137.00
Julia Hathaway	11/8	11/15	Brazil		2,236.32		5,487.70		58.16		7,782.18
Committee total					3,035.32		11,825.70		58.16		14,919.18

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. NICK J. RAHALL II, Chairman, Jan. 5, 2010.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO DENMARK, EXPENDED BETWEEN DEC. 7 AND DEC. 22, 2009

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Stacey Bako	12/07	12/09	Denmark		2,426.00		8,371.00				10,797.00
Don Kellaher	12/07	12/09	Denmark		2,426.00		8,371.00				10,797.00
Hon. Nancy Pelosi	12/17	12/19	Denmark		4,406.00		(³)				4,406.00
Hon. Steny H. Hoyer	12/17	12/19	Denmark		4,406.00		(³)				4,406.00
Hon. F. James Sensenbrenner, Jr.	12/17	12/19	Denmark		4,406.00		(³)				4,406.00
Hon. Charles B. Rangel	12/17	12/19	Denmark		4,406.00		(³)				4,406.00

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO DENMARK, EXPENDED BETWEEN DEC. 7 AND DEC. 22, 2009—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. George Miller	12/17	12/19	Denmark		4,406.00		(3)				4,406.00
Hon. Henry A. Waxman	12/17	12/19	Denmark		4,406.00		(3)				4,406.00
Hon. Edward J. Markey	12/17	12/19	Denmark		4,406.00		(3)				4,406.00
Hon. Joe Barton	12/17	12/19	Denmark		4,406.00		(3)				4,406.00
Hon. Earl Blumenauer	12/17	12/19	Denmark		4,406.00		(3)				4,406.00
Hon. Jay Inslee	12/17	12/19	Denmark		4,406.00		(3)				4,406.00
Hon. Shelley Moore Capito	12/17	12/19	Denmark		4,406.00		(3)				4,406.00
Hon. John Sullivan	12/17	12/19	Denmark		4,406.00		(3)				4,406.00
Hon. Marsha Blackburn	12/17	12/19	Denmark		4,406.00		(3)				4,406.00
Hon. Emanuel Cleaver	12/17	12/19	Denmark		4,406.00		(3)				4,406.00
Hon. Gabrielle Giffords	12/17	12/19	Denmark		4,406.00		(3)				4,406.00
Hon. Bart Gordon	12/17	12/19	Denmark		4,406.00		(3)				4,406.00
Hon. Fred Upton	12/17	12/19	Denmark		4,406.00		(3)				4,406.00
Hon. Diana DeGette	12/17	12/19	Denmark		4,406.00		(3)				4,406.00
Hon. G.K. Butterfield	12/17	12/19	Denmark		4,406.00		(3)				4,406.00
Hon. Tim Ryan	12/17	12/19	Denmark		4,406.00		(3)				4,406.00
Hon. Sander M. Levin	12/17	12/19	Denmark		4,406.00		(3)				4,406.00
Hon. Wilson Livingood	12/17	12/19	Denmark		4,406.00		(3)				4,406.00
Hon. Brian Monahan	12/17	12/19	Denmark		4,406.00		(3)				4,406.00
John Lawrence	12/17	12/19	Denmark		4,406.00		(3)				4,406.00
Karen Wayland	12/17	12/19	Denmark		4,406.00		(3)				4,406.00
Stacey Bako	12/17	12/19	Denmark		4,406.00		(3)				4,406.00
Andrew Hammill	12/17	12/19	Denmark		4,406.00		(3)				4,406.00
Kate Knudson	12/17	12/19	Denmark		4,406.00		(3)				4,406.00
Bridget Fallon	12/15	12/19	Denmark		5,075.00		6,358.00				11,443.00
Bina Surgeon	12/17	12/19	Denmark		4,406.00		(3)				4,406.00
Mary Frances Repko	12/17	12/19	Denmark		4,406.00		(3)				4,406.00
Don Kellaher	12/16	12/19	Denmark		5,075.00		4,163.00				9,238.00
Nona Darrell	12/13	12/19	Denmark		9,481.00		4,163.00				13,644.00
Tony Jackson	12/13	12/19	Denmark		9,481.00		4,163.00				13,644.00
Josh Mathis	12/14	12/19	Denmark		5,298.00		6,719.00				12,017.00
Phil Barnett	12/14	12/19	Denmark		4,629.00		5,712.00				10,341.00
David Cavicce	12/17	12/19	Denmark		4,406.00		(3)				4,406.00
Lisa Miller	12/13	12/21	Denmark		11,619.00		8,962.00				20,581.00
Peter Spencer	12/13	12/19	Denmark		9,481.00		6,719.00				16,200.00
Andrea Spring	12/13	12/21	Denmark		10,995.00		6,720.00				17,715.00
Lorie Schmitt	12/10	12/21	Denmark		11,174.00		8,333.00				19,507.00
Greg Dotson	12/12	12/21	Denmark		10,728.00		7,963.00				18,691.00
Alex Barron	12/10	12/21	Denmark		11,174.00		8,333.00				19,507.00
Christopher King	12/15	12/19	Denmark		6,990.00		6,719.00				13,709.00
Shimere Williams	12/15	12/21	Denmark		6,990.00		6,719.00				13,709.00
Tara Rothschild	12/14	12/21	Denmark		7,213.00		6,719.00				13,932.00
Margaret Caravelli	12/14	12/21	Denmark		7,213.00		6,719.00				13,932.00
Gerry Waldron	12/17	12/19	Denmark		4,406.00		(3)				4,406.00
Ana Unruh-Cohen	12/14	12/19	Denmark		5,298.00		4,163.00				9,461.00
Jeff Duncan	12/17	12/19	Denmark		4,406.00		(3)				4,406.00
Eben Burnham-Snyder	12/16	12/21	Denmark		7,677.00		10,038.00				16,805.00
Joel Beauvais	12/10	12/20	Denmark		11,264.00		8,983.00				20,247.00
Michael Goo	12/09	12/19	Denmark		10,150.00		7,268.00				17,418.00
Tom Schreiber	12/13	12/19	Denmark		9,481.00		7,983.00				17,464.00
Harlan Watson	12/06	12/21	Denmark		14,277.00		6,719.00				20,996.00
Bart Forsyth	12/13	12/22	Denmark		9,481.00		8,993.00				18,474.00
Ed Rice	12/13	12/22	Denmark		8,821.00		10,264.00				19,085.00
Steve Rusnak	12/17	12/19	Denmark		4,406.00		(3)				4,406.00
Carey Lane	12/17	12/19	Denmark		4,406.00		(3)				4,406.00
Committee total											553,564.00

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.³ Military air transportation.

HON. NANCY PELOSI, Jan. 11, 2010.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS,
ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

5748. A letter from the Chief, PRAB, Office of Research & Analysis, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — The Emergency Food Assistance Program: Amendments to Requirements Regarding the Submission of State Plans and Allowability of Certain Administrative Costs (RIN: 0584-AD94) received December 16, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

5749. A letter from the Acting NRCS Farm Bill Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Agricultural Management Assistance Program (RIN: 0578-AA50) received December 17, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

5750. A letter from the Acting NRCS Farm Bill Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Regional Equity (RIN: 0578-AA44) received December 17, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

5751. A letter from the Under Secretary of Defense, Department of Defense, transmitting a report of a violation of the Antideficiency Act by the Defense Information Systems Agency, Case Number 08-06, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1517(b); to the Committee on Appropriations.

5752. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement; Allowability of Costs to Lease Government Equipment for Display or Demonstration (DFARS Case 2007-D004) (RIN: 0750-AF85) received December 16, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

5753. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement; Technical Data and Computer Software Requirements for Major Weapon Systems (DFARS Case 2006-D055) received December 16, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

5754. A letter from the Assistant to the Board, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting the System's

“Major” final rule — Risk-Based Capital Guidelines; Capital Adequacy Guidelines; Capital Maintenance: Regulatory Capital; Impact of Modifications to Generally Accepted Accounting Principles; Consolidation of Asset-Backed Commercial Paper Programs; and Other Related Issues [Regulations H and Y; Docket No. R-1368] received January 13, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

5755. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Financial Stability, Department of the Treasury, transmitting letter summarizing the actions taken by the Department of the Treasury in response to recommendations issued in the Government Accountability Office's report on the Troubled Asset Relief Program; to the Committee on Financial Services.

5756. A letter from the Deputy to the Chairman for External Affairs, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule — Risk-Based Capital Guidelines; Capital Adequacy Guidelines; Capital Maintenance; Capital-Residential Mortgage Loans Modified Pursuant to the Home Affordable Mortgage Program (RIN: 3064-AD42) received December 16, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

5757. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Services, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's "Major" final rule — School Improvement Grants; American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA); Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as Amended (ESSA) [Docket ID: ED-209-OESE-0010] (RIN: 1810-AB06) received January 13, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

5758. A letter from the Deputy Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Organ-Specific Warnings; Internal Analgesic, Antipyretic, and Antirheumatic Drug Products for Over-the-Counter Human Use; Final Monograph; Technical Amendment [Docket No.: FDA-1977-N-0013] (formerly Docket No.: 1977-N-0094L) (RIN: 0910-AF36) received December 16, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5759. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standards; Designated Seating Positions [Docket No.: NHTSA 2009-0189] (RIN: 2127-AK65) received January 12, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5760. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standards; Air Brake Systems [Docket No.: NHTSA-2009-0175] (RIN: 2127-AK62) received January 12, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5761. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Vehicle Identification Number Requirements; Technical Amendment [Docket No.: NHTSA 2008-0022] (RIN: 2127-AK63) received January 12, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5762. A letter from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Amendment of Section 73.622(i), Final DTV Table of Allotments, Television Broadcast Stations. (Bangor, Maine) [MB Docket No. 09-122] received January 12, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5763. A letter from the General Counsel, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Mandatory Reliability Standards for the Calculation of Available Transfer Capability, Capacity Benefit Margins, Transmission Reliability Margins, Total Transfer Capability and Existing Transmission Commitments and Mandatory Reliability Standards for the Bulk-Power System [Docket No.: RM08-19-000, RM08-19-001, RM09-5-000, RM06-16-005; Order No. 729] received December 16, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5764. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting as required by section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c), and section 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1703(c), a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Cote d'Ivoire that was declared in Executive Order 13396 of February 7, 2006, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1703(c); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5765. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule—Addition of Certain Persons on the Entity List; Addition of Persons Acting Contrary to the National Security

or Foreign Policy Interests of the United States and Entry Modified for Clarification [Docket No.: 0911171410-91427-01] (RIN: 0694-AE78) received January 12, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5766. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Updated Statements of Legal Authority to Reflect Continuation of Emergency Declared in Executive Order 12938 and Changes to the United States Code [Docket No.: 0910231376-91377-01] (RIN: 0694-AE76) received December 30, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5767. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Commerce, transmitting Periodic Report on the National Emergency Caused by the Lapse of the Export Administration Act of 1979 for February 26, 2009 — August 26, 2009; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5768. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Reporting of Offsets Agreements in Sales of Weapon Systems or Defense-Related Items to Foreign Countries or Foreign Firms [Docket No.: 080722875-91412-02] (RIN: 0694-AE40) received December 30, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5769. A letter from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, President's Pay Agent, transmitting a report justifying the reasons for the extension of locality-based comparability payments to categories of positions that are in more than one executive agency, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 5304(h)(2)(C); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5770. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's Performance and Accountability report for fiscal year 2009; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5771. A letter from the Chief Financial Officer, Farm Credit Insurance Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's consolidated report addressing the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act and the Inspector General Act Amendments of 1978, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act), section 5(b); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5772. A letter from the Acting Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting letter of notification of new mileage reimbursement rate for Federal employees who use privately owned vehicles while on official travel; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5773. A letter from the Assistant Deputy Associate Administrator for Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Federal Acquisition Regulation; Federal Acquisition Circular 2005-38; Introduction [Docket FAR 2009-0001, Sequence 9] received December 9, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5774. A letter from the Acting General Counsel, Government Accountability Office, transmitting letter of compliance to the requirement in the Competition in Contracting Act of 1984; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5775. A letter from the General Counsel, Selective Service System, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5776. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator For Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric

Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Groundfish Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Individual Fishing Quota Program; Western Alaska Community Development Quota Program; Recordkeeping and Reporting; Correction [Docket No.: 0911161406-91407-01] (RIN: 0648-AY37) received December 16, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

5777. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Army, Department of Defense, transmitting recommendation for the authorization of the Comprehensive Plan report on the Mississippi Coastal Improvements Program (MsCIP); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5778. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety and Security Zone, Chicago Sanitary and Ship Canal, Romeoville, IL [Docket No.: USCG-2009-1004] (RIN: 1625-AA11) received January 6, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5779. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Security and Safety Zone; Cruise Ship Protection, Elliott Bay and Pier-91, Seattle, Washington [Docket No.: USCG-2009-0331] (RIN: 1625-AA87 and 1625-AA00) received January 9, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5780. A letter from the Attorney — Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway, Sunset Beach, North Carolina [Docket No.: USCG-2009-0985] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 6, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5781. A letter from the Attorney — Advisor, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Naval Training December 2009 and January 2010; San Clemente Island, CA [Docket No.: USCG-2009-0920] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received January 6, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5782. A letter from the Assistant Chief Counsel for General Law, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's "Major" final rule — Pipeline Safety: Integrity Management Program for Gas Distribution Pipelines [Docket No.: PHMSA-RSPA-2004-19854; Amdt. 192-113] (RIN: 2137-AE15) received December 10, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5783. A letter from the Trial Attorney, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's "Major" final rule — Positive Train Control Systems [Docket No.: FRA-2008-0132, Notice No. 3] (RIN: 2130-AC03) received January 12, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5784. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class D and E Airspace; Fort Stewart (Hinesville), GA [Docket No.: FAA-2009-0959; Airspace Docket No. 09-ASO-30] received January 12, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5785. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; General Electric Company GE90-110B1, GE90-113B, and GE90-115B Series Turbofan Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2009-0143; Directorate Identifier 2009-NE-05-AD;

Amendment 39-16135; AD 2009-25-14] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 12, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5786. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A300-600 Series Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2009-1114; Directorate Identifier 2009-NM-157-AD; Amendment 39-16134; AD 2007-10-10 R1] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 12, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5787. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; General Electric Company CF6-80C2 Series Turbofan Engines; Correction [Docket No.: FAA-2009-0018; Directorate Identifier 2009-NE-01-AD; Amendment 39-16044; AD 2009-21-07] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 12, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5788. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Model 747-400, -400D, and -400F Series Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2009-1222; Directorate Identifier 2009-NM-153-AD; Amendment 39-16160; AD 2008-10-06 R1] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 12, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5789. A letter from the Regulations Officer FHWA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Discontinuation of form FHWA-47 [FHWA Docket No.: FHWA-2009-0029] (RIN 2125-AF31) received January 12, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5790. A letter from the Regulations Officer FHWA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — National Bridge Inspection Standards [FHWA Docket No.: FHWA-2009-0074] (RIN: 2125-AF33) received January 12, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5791. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Use of Additional Portable Oxygen Concentrator Devices On Board Aircraft [Docket No.: FAA-2009-0767; SFAR 106] (RIN: 2120-AJ55) received January 12, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5792. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's annual report to Congress and the National Transportation Safety Board on the regulatory status of open safety recommendations relating to several safety issues; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5793. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 30703 Amdt. No. 3354] received January 12, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5794. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 30701 Amdt. No. 3352] received January 12, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5795. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 30704; Amdt. No. 3355] received January 12, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5796. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 30702; Amdt. No. 3353] received January 12, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5797. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of a Special Air Traffic Rule in the Vicinity of Luke Air Force Base (AFB), AZ [Docket No.: FAA-2008-1087; Amendment No. 93-95] (RIN: 2120-AJ29) received January 21, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5798. A letter from the Acting Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting Informational copies of the Reports of Building Project Survey for Panama City, FL and Clarksburg, WV; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5799. A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting Statement of actions with respect to a Government Accountability Report numbered GAO-10-2; to the Committee on Science and Technology.

5800. A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting Statement of actions with respect to a Government Accountability Report numbered GAO-10-3SU; to the Committee on Science and Technology.

5801. A letter from the Chief, Trade and Commercial Regulations Branch, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Countries Whose Pleasure Vessels May Be Issued Cruising Licenses (CBP Dec. 08-27) received December 15, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5802. A letter from the Chief, Trade and Commercial Regulations Branch, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Remote Location Filing [USCBP-2006-0001] (RIN: 1505-AB20) received December 29, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5803. A letter from the Chief, Trade & Commercial Regulations Branch, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Haitian Hemispheric Opportunity Through Partnership Encouragement Acts of 2006 and 2008 [Docket No.: USCBP-2007-0062] (RIN: 1505-AB82) received December 15, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5804. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Relief and Guidance on Corrections of Certain Failures of a Nonqualified Deferred Compensation Plan to Comply with Sec. 409A(a) [Notice 2010-06] received January 13, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5805. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule

— Automatic Approval of Changes in Funding Method for Takeover Plans and Changes in Pension Valuation Software [Announcement 2010-03] received January 13, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5806. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Special Rules for Certain Transactions Where Stated Principal Amount Does Not Exceed \$2,800.00 (Rev. Rul. 2010-2) received December 28, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5807. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Auction Rate Preferred Stock-Extension of Date for Addition of a Liquidity Facility [Notice 2010-3] received December 28, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5808. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Determination of Issue Price in the Case of Certain Debt Instruments Issued for Property (Rev. Rul. 2010-1) received December 28, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5809. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Apportionment of Tax Items among the Members of a Controlled Group of Corporations [TD 9476] (RIN: 1545-BI62; RIN 1545-BG39) received December 28, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5810. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Temporary guidance regarding certain stock distributions by publicly traded real estate investments trusts (REITs) and regulated investment companies (RICs) (Revenue Procedure 2010-12) received December 28, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5811. A letter from the Senior Advisor for Regulations, Social Security Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Technical Revisions to the Supplemental Security Income (SSI) Regulations on Income and Resources [Docket No.: SSA 2008-0034] (RIN: 0960-AG66) received January 11, 2010, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5812. A letter from the Commissioner, Social Security Administration, transmitting a proposed bill to amend titles II and XVI of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5813. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting the Commission's Performance and Accountability Report for Fiscal Year 2009; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5814. A letter from the General Counsel, Office of Government Ethics, transmitting a letter reporting that the Office of Government Ethics did not conduct or initiate competitions in FY 2009; to the Committee on Outer Continental Shelf (Ad Hoc).

5815. A letter from the Vice Chairman, Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board, transmitting the Board's quarterly report to Congress on the Status of Significant Unresolved Issues with the Department of Energy's Design and Construction Projects (dated December 07, 2009); jointly to the Committees on Armed Services and Appropriations.

5816. A letter from the Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting fourth quarterly report of FY 2009 on Uniformed Services Employment and Reemployment Rights Act; jointly to the Committees on the Judiciary and Veterans' Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. POLIS: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 1038. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3726) to establish the Castle Nugent National Historic Site at St. Croix, United States Virgin Islands, and for other purposes; and for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4474) to authorize the continued use of certain water diversions located on National Forest System land in the Frank Church-River of No Return Wilderness and the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness in the State of Idaho, and for other purposes (Rept. 111-401). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. WU (for himself and Mr. LIPINSKI):

H.R. 4502. A bill to strengthen the capacity of eligible institutions to provide instruction in nanotechnology; to the Committee on Science and Technology.

By Mr. SMITH of Texas (for himself, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. CARTER, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. COBLE, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. JORDAN of Ohio, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. ROONEY, Mr. MANZULLO, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, and Mr. CANTOR):

H.R. 4503. A bill to provide for consultation by the Department of Justice with other relevant Government agencies before determining to prosecute certain terrorism offenses in United States district court, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FOSTER:

H.R. 4504. A bill to authorize the Federal Communications Commission to issue regulations against the censorship of Internet search results, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. THORNBERRY (for himself and Mr. SNYDER):

H.R. 4505. A bill to enable State homes to furnish nursing home care to parents any of whose children died while serving in the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. COHEN (for himself, Mr. CONYERS, and Mr. SMITH of Texas):

H.R. 4506. A bill to authorize the appointment of additional bankruptcy judges, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RODRIGUEZ (for himself, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. MCCAUL, and Mr. GONZALEZ):

H.R. 4507. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to authorize the Secretary of Homeland Security to establish the Cyber Security Domestic Preparedness Consortium, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Ms. VELAZQUEZ:

H.R. 4508. A bill to provide for an additional temporary extension of programs

under the Small Business Act and the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. SCHRADER (for himself, Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee, and Mr. BLUMENAUER):

H.R. 4509. A bill to reauthorize the national small business tree planting program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 4510. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to apply the ban on contributions and expenditures by foreign nationals to domestic corporations in which foreign principals have an ownership interest; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 4511. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to prohibit corporations which employ or retain registered lobbyists from making expenditures or disbursements for electioneering communications under such Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BRALEY of Iowa:

H.R. 4512. A bill to require the Secretary of Energy to implement country-of-origin disclosure requirements with respect to motor vehicle fuels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BUCHANAN:

H.R. 4513. A bill to create jobs by providing targeted tax relief to individuals and small businesses, curb frivolous lawsuits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Financial Services, and the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CLAY (for himself, Mr. AUSTRIA, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. PAYNE, Mrs. SCHMIDT, Mr. SESTAK, and Mr. TIBERI):

H.R. 4514. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a special resource study to determine the suitability and feasibility of designating the Colonel Charles Young Home in Xenia, Ohio as a unit of the National Park System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. CONYERS (for himself and Mr. SMITH of Texas):

H.R. 4515. A bill to make certain technical and conforming amendments to the Lanham Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 4516. A bill to provide stability in the financial services industry by promoting transparency, simplicity, fairness, accountability, and equal access in the market for consumer financial products or services and ensuring that no financial company becomes too big to fail, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. HALL of New York (for himself, Mr. COHEN, and Ms. MCCOLLUM):

H.R. 4517. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to apply the ban on contributions and expenditures by foreign nationals to domestic corporations which are owned or controlled by foreign principals, to increase the civil penalties applicable to foreign nationals who violate the ban, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HALL of New York:

H.R. 4518. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to deny a deduction for image advertising expenses for any trade or business the gross receipts of which exceed \$100 million; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ISRAEL:

H.R. 4519. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Treasury to make publicly available on the Internet the electronic communications of certain TARP recipients; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mrs. MALONEY (for herself, Mr. DENT, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 4520. A bill to help prevent the occurrence of cancer resulting from the use of ultraviolet tanning lamps by imposing more stringent controls on the use of such devices, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MARKEY of Massachusetts (for himself and Mr. VAN HOLLEN):

H.R. 4521. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to agree to requests by lessees to amend certain oil and gas leases issued for Central and Western Gulf of Mexico tracts, to incorporate price thresholds applicable to royalty suspension provisions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. PASCRELL (for himself, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. COHEN, Mr. SIREN, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. LANCE, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. KAGEN, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. BOREN, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. YARMUTH, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. HOLT, Mr. STARK, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. JONES, and Mr. TIERNEY):

H.R. 4522. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to apply the ban on contributions and expenditures by foreign nationals to domestic corporations which are owned or controlled by foreign principals; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. PERRIELLO:

H.R. 4523. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to apply the ban on contributions and expenditures by foreign nationals to domestic corporations whose shareholders include any foreign principals; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. SHULER (for himself, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. BOUCHER, and Mr. PERRIELLO):

H.R. 4524. A bill to authorize funding to protect and conserve lands contiguous with the Blue Ridge Parkway to serve the public, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. WILSON of South Carolina:

H.R. 4525. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to expand the eligibility for concurrent receipt of military retired pay and veterans' disability compensation to include all members of the uniformed services who are retired under chapter 61 of such title for disability, regardless of the members' disability rating percentage; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committees on the Budget, and Veterans' Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CHAFFETZ (for himself and Mr. JORDAN of Ohio):

H.J. Res. 72. A joint resolution disapproving the action of the District of Columbia Council in approving the Religious Freedom and Civil Marriage Equality Amendment Act of 2009; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado (for himself, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. CONAWAY, and Mr. SNYDER):

H. Con. Res. 230. Concurrent resolution recognizing the 150th anniversary of the Colorado National Guard; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. COSTELLO (for himself, Mr. CLAY, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. CARNAHAN, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, and Mr. LIPINSKI):

H. Con. Res. 231. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that a commemorative postage stamp should be issued to honor the life of Elijah Parish Lovejoy; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. LEE of New York (for himself, Mr. ADLER of New Jersey, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. TEAGUE, Mr. LUJÁN, Mr. CAO, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. KAGEN, Mr. KIND, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, and Mr. HARP-ER):

H. Con. Res. 232. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that a site in Arlington National Cemetery should be provided for a memorial marker to honor the memory of the 14 members of the Army's 24th Infantry Division who have received the Medal of Honor; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. NYE:

H. Res. 1037. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the actions by United States Armed Forces and first responders to help the people of Haiti after the recent devastating earthquake reflect the highest level of dedication and heroism; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LEE of New York (for himself, Mr. ARCURI, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. PUTNAM, Mr. PAULSEN, and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina):

H. Res. 1039. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of American Heart Month and National Wear Red Day; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. SNYDER (for himself, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. ROSS, and Mr. BERRY):

H. Res. 1040. A resolution honoring the life and accomplishments of Donald Harington for his contributions to literature in the United States; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of Rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

227. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Senate of the State of Michigan, relative to Senate Resolution No. 103 memorializing the Congress of the United States to Enact the Investment in Rural Afterschool Programs Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

228. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, relative to House Resolution No. 562 memorializing the Congress in its health care reform decisions to apply the American Cancer Society's guidelines for breast cancer screening; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

229. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Hawaii, relative to a letter urg-

ing the U.S. Congress to meet its fiscal obligation to the citizens of Micronesia, the Marshall Islands and Palau who reside in Hawaii; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

230. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of Michigan, relative to Senate Resolution No. 100 urging the U.S. Congress and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to take immediate actions to prevent the Asian Carp from entering the Great Lakes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 21: Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California.

H.R. 39: Mr. LOEBSACK and Mr. McDERMOTT.

H.R. 43: Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. PITTS, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. FILNER, Mr. JONES, Mr. TIERNEY, Mrs. MALONEY, and Mr. GONZALEZ.

H.R. 197: Mr. OWENS.

H.R. 211: Mr. GRAVES.

H.R. 272: Mr. THORNBERRY.

H.R. 394: Mr. WHITFIELD.

H.R. 476: Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, and Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin.

H.R. 510: Mr. LATHAM.

H.R. 519: Mr. McMAHON.

H.R. 537: Mr. REYES.

H.R. 560: Mr. TIAHRT.

H.R. 571: Mr. MICHAUD.

H.R. 678: Mr. WILSON of Ohio, Mr. WEINER, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. HINCHEY, and Mrs. LOWEY.

H.R. 690: Mr. MICHAUD and Mr. HINCHEY.

H.R. 745: Mr. HALL of New York.

H.R. 795: Mr. CLAY.

H.R. 997: Mr. GOHMERT.

H.R. 1020: Ms. CHU and Ms. FUDGE.

H.R. 1026: Mr. MARCHANT.

H.R. 1159: Ms. WOOLSEY.

H.R. 1177: Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas and Mr. BRIGHT.

H.R. 1204: Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina.

H.R. 1310: Ms. CHU.

H.R. 1314: Mrs. CAPPS and Mr. KISSELL.

H.R. 1326: Mr. TONKO.

H.R. 1347: Mr. KRATOVIL.

H.R. 1526: Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN and Mr. MITCHELL.

H.R. 1557: Mr. ADLER of New Jersey.

H.R. 1583: Mr. SIMPSON.

H.R. 1587: Mr. STUPAK.

H.R. 1588: Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 1806: Mr. PERRIELLO.

H.R. 1826: Mr. KENNEDY and Ms. SPEIER.

H.R. 1835: Mrs. EMERSON and Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida.

H.R. 1866: Mr. REHBERG.

H.R. 1873: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 1895: Mr. ADLER of New Jersey.

H.R. 1957: Mr. CONYERS and Mr. COURTNEY.

H.R. 1964: Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, and Ms. WATSON.

H.R. 2149: Ms. ESHOO.

H.R. 2254: Mr. ROONEY, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. LINDER, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, and Mr. OWENS.

H.R. 2296: Mr. COSTELLO.

H.R. 2377: Ms. BERKLEY and Mrs. MALONEY.

H.R. 2478: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, and Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 2480: Ms. NORTON and Mr. KISSELL.

H.R. 2521: Mr. BRALEY of Iowa.

H.R. 2546: Ms. RICHARDSON.

H.R. 2547: Ms. JENKINS and Mrs. BLACKBURN.

H.R. 2553: Mr. POSEY.

H.R. 2563: Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN.

H.R. 2579: Mr. ELLISON.

H.R. 2597: Ms. RICHARDSON and Mr. FILNER.

H.R. 2669: Mr. ISRAEL.

H.R. 2733: Ms. KOSMAS, Mr. SHULER, Mr. BACA, Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. LYNCH.

H.R. 2740: Mr. WEINER.

H.R. 2799: Mr. WHITFIELD and Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado.

H.R. 2855: Mr. CLEAVER.

H.R. 2866: Mrs. LOWEY and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

H.R. 2882: Ms. HARMAN and Mr. MOORE of Kansas.

H.R. 2906: Mrs. MALONEY.

H.R. 2946: Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California and Mr. MASSA.

H.R. 2964: Mr. LOEBSACK, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, and Mrs. SCHMIDT.

H.R. 2969: Mr. ISRAEL.

H.R. 3012: Mr. ISRAEL.

H.R. 3017: Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. NYE, and Mrs. KIRKPATRICK of Arizona.

H.R. 3047: Mr. CUMMINGS and Mr. GONZALEZ.

H.R. 3077: Ms. WATSON.

H.R. 3078: Mr. CONYERS.

H.R. 3156: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. RUSH, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. PERRIELLO, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, Ms. LEE of California, and Ms. WATSON.

H.R. 3164: Ms. BERKLEY.

H.R. 3189: Ms. MARKEY of Colorado.

H.R. 3249: Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 3277: Ms. FUDGE.

H.R. 3286: Mrs. LOWEY and Mr. COOPER.

H.R. 3380: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, and Mrs. DAHLKEMPER.

H.R. 3464: Mr. CHILDERS.

H.R. 3549: Mr. MICA.

H.R. 3564: Mr. CLAY and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.

H.R. 3582: Ms. GRANGER.

H.R. 3627: Mr. LUJÁN.

H.R. 3652: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.

H.R. 3656: Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey.

H.R. 3695: Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. MURPHY of New York, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. LEE of New York, and Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida.

H.R. 3712: Mr. TOWNS, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. TURNER, Mr. CONAWAY, and Mr. BARTLETT.

H.R. 3721: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.

H.R. 3734: Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 3749: Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN.

H.R. 3752: Mr. MORAN of Kansas.

H.R. 3758: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 3790: Mr. COSTELLO and Mr. CLEAVER.

H.R. 3813: Mr. MURTHA.

H.R. 3822: Mr. NEUGEBAUER.

H.R. 3824: Mr. NEUGEBAUER.

H.R. 3838: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 3914: Ms. MARKEY of Colorado.

H.R. 3943: Mrs. DAHLKEMPER, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. AKIN, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Ms. FALLIN, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. McCAUL, and Ms. WATSON.

H.R. 3995: Mr. STUPAK.

H.R. 4000: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois and Ms. BORDALLO.

H.R. 4022: Mr. PAUL.

H.R. 4037: Mr. COURTNEY.

H.R. 4051: Mr. MURTHA and Mr. FATTAH.

H.R. 4053: Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia and Mr. CUMMINGS.

H.R. 4090: Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania and Mr. ETHERIDGE.

H.R. 4091: Mr. POE of Texas.

H.R. 4104: Mr. MASSA and Mr. GORDON of Tennessee.

H.R. 4112: Mr. WILSON of Ohio.

H.R. 4116: Ms. GIFFORDS and Mr. LEVIN.

H.R. 4144: Mr. KLEIN of Florida and Mrs. BLACKBURN.

H.R. 4148: Ms. FUDGE.

H.R. 4149: Mr. TOWNS.
 H.R. 4177: Mr. ORTIZ and Mr. HINOJOSA.
 H.R. 4191: Mr. CARDOZA.
 H.R. 4199: Mr. HODES.
 H.R. 4202: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts,
 MRS. MALONEY, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr.
 TONKO, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, Mr.
 GRIJALVA, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, and Mr.
 HODES.
 H.R. 4220: Mr. CARTER.
 H.R. 4226: Mr. PAUL.
 H.R. 4234: Mr. GOHMERT and Mr. MARCHANT.
 H.R. 4241: Mr. KING of New York.
 H.R. 4247: Mr. DEFazio, Mr. HIMES, Mr.
 HOLT, and Ms. SLAUGHTER.
 H.R. 4258: Mr. MANZULLO and Mr. LARSEN of
 Washington.
 H.R. 4269: Mr. MASSA.
 H.R. 4274: Mr. BLUMENAUER and Ms. RICH-
 ARDSON.
 H.R. 4278: Mr. ARCURI.
 H.R. 4295: Mr. MAFFEL.
 H.R. 4302: Ms. WOOLSEY.
 H.R. 4311: Mr. McMAHON.
 H.R. 4312: Mr. BISHOP of Utah.
 H.R. 4324: Mr. NYE, Mr. HARPER, and Mr.
 KLEIN of Florida.
 H.R. 4343: Mr. COHEN, Mr. THOMPSON of Mis-
 sissippi, and Mr. CLAY.
 H.R. 4356: Mr. OLVER, Mr. FARR, and Ms.
 KILPATRICK of Michigan.
 H.R. 4378: Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of Cali-
 fornia, Mr. SHULER, Mr. MEEKS of New York,
 Ms. SUTTON, Mr. TOWNS, and Mr.
 BUTTERFIELD.
 H.R. 4386: Mr. INSLEE.
 H.R. 4393: Ms. KOSMAS.
 H.R. 4400: Mr. ELLISON, Ms. KOSMAS, Mr.
 ELLSWORTH, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr.
 LOEBSACK, and Mr. BUCHANAN.
 H.R. 4403: Mr. NYE.
 H.R. 4413: Mr. EDWARDS of Texas.
 H.R. 4427: Mrs. SCHMIDT, Mr. SOUDER, and
 Mrs. BLACKBURN.
 H.R. 4453: Mr. MCCOTTER and Mr. SENSEN-
 BRENNER.
 H.R. 4459: Mr. GALLEGLY.
 H.R. 4465: Mrs. BLACKBURN, Ms. BORDALLO,
 and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.
 H.R. 4472: Mr. MCCOTTER and Mr. KILDEE.
 H.R. 4490: Mr. CALVERT, Mr. WOLF, Mrs.
 BONO MACK, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. PENCE, Mr.
 BURTON of Indiana, and Mr. MANZULLO.
 H.R. 4493: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.
 H.J. Res. 13: Mr. MORAN of Virginia and Mr.
 RYAN of Ohio.
 H.J. Res. 37: Mr. MANZULLO.
 H.J. Res. 66: Mrs. BLACKBURN and Mr. BUR-
 TON of Indiana.
 H. Con. Res. 227: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHN-
 SON of Texas, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr.
 PIERLUISI.
 H. Res. 111: Mr. PETRI and Mr. CHILDERS.
 H. Res. 213: Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. GRIJALVA,
 Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Mr.
 SERRANO, Mr. HONDA, and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
 H. Res. 243: Mr. GARAMENDI.
 H. Res. 267: Mr. MCCOTTER, Ms. HARMAN,
 Mr. QUIGLEY, and Mr. TANNER.
 H. Res. 278: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
 H. Res. 330: Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. BOREN, Ms.
 ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. CONAWAY,
 Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. BERRY,
 Mr. BRIGHT, Mr. HONDA, and Mr. MINNICK.
 H. Res. 375: Mr. GRAYSON and Mr. MASSA.
 H. Res. 443: Ms. CHU.

H. Res. 611: Mr. YARMUTH.
 H. Res. 704: Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. ROONEY, Mr.
 QUIGLEY, Mr. FALOMAVAEGA, Mr. FOSTER,
 Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. POSEY, and Mr. ROSKAM.
 H. Res. 872: Mrs. MYRICK and Mr. BURTON of
 Indiana.
 H. Res. 874: Mr. CONAWAY.
 H. Res. 879: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of
 Texas, Mr. OWENS, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. ELLS-
 WORTH, Ms. KOSMAS, Mr. DONNELLY of Indi-
 ana, Mr. MELANCON, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr.
 CROWLEY, Ms. MARKEY of Colorado, Mr.
 CHILDERS, Mr. BOREN, Mr. TONKO, Ms. SHEA-
 PORTER, Ms. SUTTON, Ms. EDWARDS of Mary-
 land, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. PASTOR of Arizona,
 Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. BOYD, Mr.
 BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. SAR-
 BANES, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. MCCOLLUM,
 Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr.
 FALOMAVAEGA, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of Cali-
 fornia, Mr. BERRY, Mr. SCHAUER, Mr. HIMES,
 Mr. PERLMUTTER, and Mr. WATT.
 H. Res. 925: Mr. WAMP, Mr. PLATTS, and Mr.
 BRADY of Pennsylvania.
 H. Res. 929: Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr.
 NADLER of New York, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr.
 ELLISON, and Ms. DEGETTE.
 H. Res. 958: Mr. LIPINSKI.
 H. Res. 990: Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. MARKEY of
 Massachusetts, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. PRICE of
 North Carolina, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, and
 Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California.
 H. Res. 996: Mrs. DAHLKEMPER, Mr. SES-
 SIONS, Mr. MARCHANT, Ms. MOORE of Wis-
 consin, Ms. CLARKE, Ms. KILPATRICK of
 Michigan, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. MEEKS of New
 York, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr.
 LATOURETTE, Mr. COURTNEY, and Mr. TOWNS.
 H. Res. 1003: Mr. DINGELL, Mr. MEEK of
 Florida, Mr. RUSH, Mr. WEINER, Mr. SABLON,
 Mr. OBERSTAR, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr.
 THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. JACKSON of Illi-
 nois, Mr. COSTA, Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut,
 Ms. LEE of California, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr.
 WELCH, and Ms. MCCOLLUM.
 H. Res. 1011: Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. KENNEDY,
 Ms. SPEIER, Mr. NYE, Mr. PETERS, Mr.
 GEORGE MILLER of California, and Ms. ROS-
 LEHTINEN.
 H. Res. 1014: Mr. MICHAUD, Ms. WASSERMAN
 SCHULTZ, Mr. LANCE, Mrs. McMORRIS ROD-
 GERS, Mr. MAFFEL, Mr. KIRK, Mr. KAGEN, Mr.
 WOLF, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. HOLT, Mr. PAYNE, Mr.
 MASSA, Mr. ISRAEL, Ms. PINGREE of Maine,
 Mr. KLEIN of Florida, Mr. MEEK of Florida,
 Mr. SIRES, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Ms.
 FUDGE, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mrs.
 MALONEY, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. TONKO, Mr.
 MOORE of Kansas, Mr. NADLER of New York,
 Mr. LOBIONDO, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. SERRANO,
 Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. NORTON,
 Mr. MEEKS of New York, and Mr. HODES.
 H. Res. 1019: Mr. MORAN of Virginia.
 H. Res. 1022: Mr. ELLISON and Mr. NADLER
 of New York.
 H. Res. 1024: Mr. STARK, Ms. LINDA T.
 SANCHEZ of California, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois,
 Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, and Ms. MCCOLLUM.
 H. Res. 1029: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN and Mr.
 PLATTS.
 H. Res. 1033: Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. WILSON of
 South Carolina, Mrs. BONO MACK, Mr. YOUNG
 of Florida, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. BURTON of In-
 diana, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. LEE of New York,
 Mr. SHUSTER, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. DAVIS
 of Kentucky, Mr. HERGER, Ms. GRANGER, Mr.
 WESTMORELAND, and Mr. WOLF.

H. Res. 1034: Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr.
 CUMMINGS, and Mr. BERMAN.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIM- ITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIM- ITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or
 statements on congressional earmarks,
 limited tax benefits, or limited tariff
 benefits were submitted as follows:

OFFERED BY MR. RAHALL

H.R. 4474, the Idaho Wilderness Water Fa-
 cilities Act, does not contain any congres-
 sional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or lim-
 ited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of
 rule XXI.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, peti-
 tions and papers were laid on the
 Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

95. The SPEAKER presented a petition of
 The City of Key West, Florida, relative to
 Resolution No. 09-292 urging the Congress of
 the United States to adopt the Military
 Readiness Enhancement Act of 2009; to the
 Committee on Armed Services.

96. Also, a petition of San Francisco Labor
 Council, California, relative to a Resolution
 in solidarity for the people of Honduras and
 urging the U.S. Congress to take strong
 measures against the repressive coup govern-
 ment in Honduras; to the Committee on For-
 eign Affairs.

97. Also, a petition of Board of Supervisors
 of San Francisco, California, relative to Re-
 solution No. 488-09 urging the Congress of the
 United States to legislatively support a
 strong Treaty to address Climate Change; to
 the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

98. Also, a petition of The City of Key
 West, Florida, relative to Resolution No. 09-
 293 urging the Congress of the United States
 and the President to repeal the Defense of
 Marriage Act; to the Committee on the Judi-
 ciary.

99. Also, a petition of The Legislature of
 Rockland County, New York, relative to Re-
 solution No. 596 petitioning the Congress of
 the United States to introduce and pass Leg-
 islation Establishing a U.S. Commission
 Aimed Solely at Monitoring and Combating
 Modern-Day Slavery in All Its Forms; jointly
 to the Committees on the Judiciary and
 Foreign Affairs.

100. Also, a petition of City Council of
 Watsonville, California, relative to Resolu-
 tion No. 207-09 supporting the Dream Act of
 2009 to Relieve Obstacles to Higher Edu-
 cation and Permanent Residency for Long-
 term Immigrant but Non-Resident Minors;
 jointly to the Committees on the Judiciary
 and Education and Labor.

101. Also, a petition of The Legislature of
 Rockland County, New York, relative to Re-
 solution No. 535 urging the U.S. House of Rep-
 resentatives to pass H.R. 1691; jointly to the
 Committees on Energy and Commerce, Ways
 and Means, and Education and Labor.